Wing
W 1721
5/5

A DEMONSTRATION THAT THE Church of Rome, AND HER COUNCILS HAVE ERRED:

BY SHEWING,

That the COUNCILS of *Constance*, *Basil*, and *Trent*, have, in all their Decrees touching Communion in one Kind, contradicted the Received Doctrine of the *Church* of *Christ*.

[WHITBY, BP.]

WITH AN

APPENDIX,

In ANSWER to

The XXI. Chapter of the Author of *A Papist Misrepresented, and Represented.*

LONDON,

Printed by *J. Leake*, and are to be Sold by *Randal Taylor*, M DC LXXXVIII.

IMPRIMATUR.

Apr. 11. 1688. *Guil. Needham.*

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

The Contents *of the* Preface.

This Diſcourſe plainly overthrows all the Foundations of the Romiſh Faith, ſhewing 1. That the Romiſh Councils and the Church of *Rome*, cannot be the ſole authentick Interpreters of Scripture, or the true Judges of Tradition, §. 1. 2*ly*. That they were not aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt in making this Decree touching Communion in one Kind, §. 2. 3*ly*. That the Councils of *Conſtance*, *Baſil*, and *Trent* were not true General Councils, or that ſuch Councils muſt be ſubject unto Error, §. 3. 4*ly*. That there is no Certainty of the Romiſh Faith by oral Tradition, §. 4. 5*ly*. That theſe Councils ridiculouſly do aſſert, That they made their Decrees touching Communion in one Kind conſulting the Advantage and Salvation of Chriſtian People, §. 5. 6*ly*. That the Decrees of the Councils of *Piſa*, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil* concerning the Superiority of a General Council over the Pope, and their Authority to decree Matters of Faith without him, muſt be allowed to be valid, or we can have no Aſſurance of the Validity and Infallibility of any of their Councils, §. 6.

BY *way of Preface to this Diſcourſe I ſhall endeavour briefly, and plainly to demonſtrate,*

1. *That it plainly overthroweth all the Certainty of the* Romiſh *Faith, and that if they have made theſe* Definitions *and* Decrees *in oppoſition to the plain Sence of* Scripture, *and the Inter-*

pretations of it by the Holy Fathers, *and to the full Tradition of the* Church *in former Ages, these their received* Councils *cannot be by Gods Appointment, the* Judges *of our* Controversies, *the* authentick Interpreters of Scripture, *or assisted by the* Holy Ghost *in making these Decisions, nor can they be Assertors of, or Adherers to* primitive Tradition, *but rather plain Desertors of it. And,*

§. 1. First, *Whereas they challenge as their undoubted Right, Authority to be the sole* authentick Interpreters of the Sence of Scripture, *and the true Judges of the* Tradition *of the* Church *of* Christ. *Hence we may learn what excellent* Interpreters *they are of* Scripture *and* Tradition; *For, whereas the* Trent Council *hath in*

(a) *Sess.* 4. *General defined that it belongeth to the* Church *alone,* (a) Judicare de vero sensu, & interpretatione Sanctarum Scripturarum, To judge of the true sence and meaning of the Holy Scriptures: *And*

(b) *Sess.* 21. *c.* 1. *particularly, That* being taught by the Holy Spirit, (b) *Atque ipsius Ecclesiæ judicium & consuetudinem secuta*, And following the Judgment and Custom of the Church, *she made the forementioned* Decrees *touching* Communion *in one Kind.*

Secondly. *Whereas the* Council *of* Constance *saith, That they*

(c) *Sess.* 13. *made their Decrees concerning the same Matter,* (c) Plurium doctorum tam divini quam humani juris deliberatione præhabitâ, After mature Deliberation had with many Doctors, skilful both in divine and humane Laws. *And lastly, whereas the* Council *of* Basil *hath declared, That they determined the same*

(d) *Sess.* 30. *Matter,* (d) Post diligentem perscrutationem divinarum Scripturarum sacrorumque Canonum, & doctrinarum à Sanctis Patribus, & Doctoribus traditarum, in hac Synodo, longis temporibus habitam; After a diligent Search made, in this Synod, for a long time, of holy Scriptures, of the sacred Canons, and of the Doctrines delivered by the holy Fathers. *I say, Whereas they do expresly, and confidently pretend these things; I think it will be evident from this Discourse, That in those Matters they plainly have decreed against the clear and formerly received Sence of* Scriptures, *against the* Doctrines *delivered by the* Holy Fathers, *and by the sacred* Canons, *and against the Judgment and Custom of the* Church *of God in former Ages. So that if it belong unto the* Church *alone* to judge of the true Sense and Meaning of the Holy Scriptures, *these* Councils, *and those* Churches *which have embraced their Interpretations of the* Scriptures *concerned in this Dispute,*

Diſpute, could not be the Church Repreſentative *or* Catholick, *but falſly did, and do pretend to theſe Titles. If it belong unto the* Church *to teach us what is* Tradition, *they who aſſert theſe things as ſuitable to the Doctrines delivered by the Holy* Fathers, *and to the Judgment of the* Church, *cannot deſerve that Title.*

Again, Thirdly, *Whereas the* Trent Council *ſaith, That in making theſe Decrees ſhe was* (e) Inſtructed by the Holy Ghoſt, who is the Spirit of Wiſdom and of Underſtanding, of Counſel and of Piety, *whereas the* Council *of* Conſtance *and of* Baſil, *in making their* Decrees *touching this Article; Declare they were* a Holy General Synod, *in Spiritu Sancto legitimè congregata,* Met rightly together in the Holy Ghoſt: *Hence it is evident that,* 1. *They falſly pretended to the Aſſiſtance of the Holy* Spirit, *who being the* Spirit of Truth, *the Inditer of the Sacred* Scripture, *would not aſſiſt them to determine contrary to the Truth delivered there; and being alſo the Spirit promiſed to aſſiſt his* Church, *and guide her true and living Members* into all *ſaving* Truth, *could not aſſiſt them to Decree againſt the Practice, and the Judgment of the* Church *of* Chriſt *for a Thouſand years.* §. 2.

(e) *Ipſa Synodus à Spiritu Sancto, qui eſt Spiritus ſapientiæ & intellectus, Spiritus conſilii & pietatis, edocta. Seſſ. 21. c. 1. Ibid.*

2. *Hence alſo it muſt follow that theſe* Councils, *tho, as to theſe Definitions, they are own'd as truly* General, *by the whole* Church *of* Rome, *were not true* General Councils, *or that true* General Councils *confirmed by the* Pope, *and owned by the whole* Church *of* Rome, *may erre in Matters of Faith, in the Interpretation of the Holy* Scriptures, *and in their Judgment of* Tradition. §. 3.

3. *And whereas our late* Roman-Diſputants *have laid the whole Certainty of their Faith upon the Infallibility of* oral Tradition, delivering to them the ſame Doctrine to day which was delivered yeſterday, and ſo up to the time of our Saviour, *it muſt be as evident they have no Certainty of* Roman *Faith, as it is evident from this, and other late Treatiſes, That they have varied from the* Tradition *of the* Church *in the Practice of* latin Service, *the* Veneration of Images, *and the* Subſtraction *of the* Cup, *and we deſire nothing more of the moſt wavering Perſons, than that they would not go over to that* Church *till they ſee greater Evidence that they have never varied from what was once taught and delivered in the* Church *of* Chriſt, *than theſe Diſcourſes offer to evince that they have actually done it.* §. 4. Mr. G. & Mr. M.

4. *Moreover*

§. 5. 4. *Moreover hence we may learn how excellently these* Councils *have consulted for the Advantage, and the Salvation of Christian People. The Fathers of the* Council *of* Constance *pretend to have made their Decrees in reference to this Matter,* (f) Saluti fidelium providere satagentes, Endeavouring to provide for the Salvation of the Faithful, *The* Council *of* Basil *preface their Decree against Communion in both Kinds, with a Pretence that they had honestly consulted.* (g) Quid circa perceptionem S. Eucharistiæ tenendum sit & agendum pro utilitate & salute populi Christiani, What was to be held or done about the receiving of the Eucharist for the Advantage and Salvation of Christian People. *The* Council *of* Trent *insinuates that she hath established this Custom, because it was only such a Change in Dispensation of this Sacrament as the* Church (h) Utilitati suscipientium magis expedire judicaret, Judged most expedient for the Benefit of the Receivers.

(f) *Sess.* 13.

(g) *Sess.* 30.

(h) *Sess.* 21. *c.* 2.

It therefore seems our Lord, *and his* Apostles, *and the whole* primitive Church *for a Thousand Years, saith their* (i) Cassander, *for a Thousand and two hundred Years, saith* (k) Cardinal Bona, *were wickedly unmindful of the* Advantage *and* Salvation of Christian People, *for our* Lord *instituted, and in compliance with his Institution, his* Apostles *and the whole* Christian Church, *for the forementioned* Centuries, *did minister the* Sacrament *in both Kinds, till those good Souls, filled with true Zeal for the* Salvation of all christian People, *Et spiritu pietatis edocti,* And taught by the Spirit of true Piety, *forbad them to receive* the Cup of Life; *the* Apostles, *and all the ancient* Fathers *and* Councils *of the* Church *were either so ignorant, or heedless, as that they never thought of making any Laws against* Christ's Institution, *till the* Councils *of* Basil, Constance *and* Trent, assisted with the Spirit of Wisdom, Understanding and Counsel, *found it expedient so to do, and for the Benefit and* Salvation *of the Laity, to decree peremptorily that they hereafter never should receive* the Cup of Blessing and Salvation, *That they should never drink of* the Blood of the New Covenant, *the Blood of their* Redemption, the Blood shed for the Remission of their Sins. *They were so ignorant, or so regardless of the Reverence due to the* Holy Eucharist, *That neither the Perils which might happen to it from* the long Beards of the Communicants, *or by* growing acid, *or by being* shed, *could make them think it fit to alter the Institution of our* Lord, *or the Practice*

(i) *Consult. Art.* 22. *p.* 981.

(k) *Rerum liturg. l.* 2. *c.* 18. *p.* 862.

Practice of the Church. *They thought so little of* the Scarcity of Wine *in some Countries, and of the* Aversation *that some others had unto the taste or the smell of it, that none of all these weighty Reasons, though they were the same in the First Ages of the* Church, *as in the Thirteenth and the Fourteenth* Centuries, *could move them, out of Reverence to our* Lord's *Institution, to forbid the Practice of it, till these* (l) Gravissimæ Rationes, Most weighty Reasons, *being deliberately considered by the* Roman Catholick Church, *She, to prevent those dreadful Perils, and these Scandals, introduced this new Custom, and confirmed it* for a Law *in Opposition both to our* Saviour's Institution, *and to the Practice of the* Church *in which she had continued for a Thousand Years to the great Damage, and the Hindrance of the Salvation of her People, till these* Councils *so happily bestir'd themselves for their* Advantage *and* Salvation.

(l) *Catech. Trid. Part. 2. c. 4. Sect. 66.*

And Thirdly, Whereas these Councils, *in framing these Decrees style the Practice of Communicating under one Kind* (m) Romanæ & Universalis Ecclesiæ consuetudo approbata, The approved Custom of the Roman and Universal Church, *and of the* (n) Holy Catholick Church, *and the Declaration made concerning it at* Basil, *is called* Declaratio Catholicæ veritatis, (o) The Declaration of the Catholick Truth: *Not to observe at present how horribly Uncharitable these* Councils *are, in excluding out of the* Catholick Church, *and consequently from Salvation, all who had not consented to the Violation of our* Lord's Institution, *and to the Alteration of the Practice of the* Church *of* Christ, *for a whole Thousand Years; That is, not only all who in the* West *refused to make so bold with our* Lord's Institution, *but all the* Greek *and* Eastern Churches; *I say, not to insist on this, hence it is evident, That the present Practice and Judgment of what they call the* Catholick and Universal Church, *can be no certain or sufficient Proof of* Tradition Apostolical, *since in this Matter, she hath both practised and decreed in Opposition to the plain Judgment and* Tradition *of the* Church *of* Christ *for Ten whole Centuries.*

(m) *Concil. Const. Sess. 13.*

(n) *Consil. Trid. Sess. 21. Can. 2.*

(o) *Sess. 30.*

To these Considerations, which concern the Definitions of these Councils *touching Communion in one Kind, I add these following Remarks touching these* Councils, *and the* Decrees *which they confirmed in their* Assemblies. §. 6.

1. *Therefore, touching the* Councils *of* Constance *and of* Basil, *let it be considered, that they constantly declare, That they were* Holy

Holy Synods, assembled in the Holy Ghost, and representing the Church Catholick. *The* General Council *of* (p) Pisa *which agreed with them in their Sentiments, and met about the same Affairs ascribes unto it self the same great Titles.*

(p) *Sess.* 8. 14.

(q) *Concil. To.* 7. *p.* 994.

2. *Note that there were present at the* Council *of* Pisa, *saith* (q) Binius, Three Patriarchs, Twenty three Cardinals, Thirty Arch-Bishops, Two hundred and eighty Governors of Monasteries, the Divines, and Legats of the Princes of *Europe. There were present at that* Council, *saith* (r) Richerius, an Hundred and eighty Arch-Bishops and Bishops, Three hundred Governours of Monasteries, an Hundred and twenty Masters in Theology, Three hundred Doctors of the canon and the civil Law, the Legats of Christian Princes, and the Legats and Procurators of all the Universities of Europe.

(r) *Hist. Consil. General. l.* 2 *c.* 1. *p.* 35.

At the Council *of* Constance, *saith* (s) Binius, *there were* Four Patriarchs, Twenty nine Cardinals, Forty seven Arch-Bishops, an Hundred and sixty Bishops, and of Abbots, Provosts, and Priors, and of all sorts of Clerks a very great Number.

(s) *To.* 7. *p.* 1134.

To the Council *of* Basil, *saith the same* (t) Binius, *came* a very great Multitude of Prelates from the whole Latin World.

(t) *To.* 8. *p.* 525.

Having premised these things, I ask whether these Councils *knew themselves full and entire Representatives of the* Church Catholick, *and* Councils assisted by the Holy Ghost, *or they did not? If they did know themselves to be true* General Councils, *representing the* Church Catholick, &c. *then they undoubtedly were so. And then why were they represented by the Fifth* Lateran Council *as* schismatical seditious Councils, and of no Authority; *Why are they stiled* Concilia Reprobata, Reprobated Councils, *by the greatest Part of* Roman Catholicks, *in reference to some of these things which they profess to have decided under this* Majestick Character? *Why is it yet left free for any* Romanist *to reject their Authority, and Decrees in many Matters? Moreover, if they were true* General Councils representing the whole Church, *and* assisted by the Holy Ghost, *either such* Councils *must have erred in what they have decreed as matter of Faith, and therefore cannot be Infallible, and then the whole* Church Representative, *and* Councils assisted by the Holy Ghost *may erre in matters of Faith, or if they did not erre, it must be matter of Faith, That* a General Council is superior to the Pope. *Secondly,* That General Councils may infallibly determine matters of Faith without him, yea,

Concilium Constantiense ubi definit Concilium esse supra Papam, reprobatum est in Concilio Florentino & Lateranensi ultimo. Bellar. de Concil. l. 1. c. 7. de Concil. partim Reprobatis.

yea, against him. Thirdly, *That* the pertinacious Resisters of this Doctrine were Hereticks, *and therefore that* Eugenius *the* 4th. Julius *the* 2d. Leo *the* 10th. *and the* 5th. Lateran Council *were* Heretical.

If they did not know the Truth of what they thus assert, how shall private Persons be able to discern what such Assemblies, *and so many* Universities *and* Churches *throughout the World consenting with them, and owning them as such, could not discern? That is, how shall they know when* Councils *are truly* General, *when they truly represent the* Church Catholick, *and truly are* assisted by the Holy Ghost? *Was not this one of their* Decrees, *That for the future,* Quilibet in R. Pontificem eligendus, Every one that was to be chosen Pope should in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost with Heart and Mouth Profess to God Almighty, and to blessed *Peter*, firmly to believe, and hold, as long as he lived, the holy Catholick Faith, according to the Traditions of the Apostles, the general Councils, and in particular, of the general Councils of *Lateran*, *Lyons*, *Vienna*, *Constance* and *Basil*, and to keep that Faith to a tittle unchanged, (a) *Et usque ad animam & sanguinem confirmare, defensare & praedicare,* And to preach, confirm and defend it with their Life and Blood? *Did not the following* Popes, *till after the Time of* Eugenius *the* 4th. *make this Profession? Yea, were not the* Inquisitors *of* Hereticks *obliged by the* Council *of* Constance *to enquire of any who lay under Suspicion of* Heresy, (b) Whether he believed, held, and asserted, That every general Council, and particularly that of *Constance* represents the Universal Church, and whether he believed that what that Council, representing the whole Church, approved in favour of Faith, and the welfare of Souls, was to be approved by all the Faithful, and what it condemned as contrary to Faith and good Manners, was as such to be condemned? *And, after this Profession of these* Popes, *this Inquisition made by all concerned to find out, and prosecute Persons suspected of* Heresy, *could they be doubtful whether these* Councils *were truly General, or no? Would they condemn Men of* Heresy *for not believing these Articles, if they themselves did not believe them? What Hopes*

(a) *Consil. Const. Sess.* 39. *Basil. Sess.* 23. 37.

(b) *Utrum credat, teneat, & asserat, quod quodlibet Concilium Generale, & etiam Constantinense Universalem Ecclesiam representet. Item utrum credat, quod illud quod Sacrum Concilium Constantinense Universalem Ecclesiam Representans, approbavit & approbat in favorem fidei, & salutem animarum, quod hoc est ab universis Christi fidelibus approbandum, & tenendum: Et quod condemnavit & condemnat esse fidei, & bonis moribus contrarium, hoc ab eisdem esse tenendum pro condemnato, credendum, & asserendum.* Sess. 45. apud Binium Tom 7. p. 1124.

can private Persons have, that they shall surely know when Councils *represent the* Church, *and are accepted by it, if the Agreement of so many* Nations, *so many* Universities, *so many* Cardinals, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Divines *and* Doctors, *the Profession of so many* Popes, *the Practice of so many* Inquisitors, *do not prove that these* Councils *were once accepted by the* Church.

Again, Was there any Scripture, *or* Tradition *of the* Church *which plainly taught the contrary; if not, there can be none now, and so no Man can have just Cause, from* Scripture *or* Tradition, *to doubt the Infallibility of these* Councils, *That* they represented the whole Church, and were assisted by the Holy Ghost, *That they were* above the Pope, *and* Representatives of the Church Catholick without Dependance on him. *If either plain* Scripture, *or* Tradition *contradicted these their Assertions and Determinations, then must these great* Assemblies, *and all the* Universities, Nations, *and* Churches *which owned them as true* general Councils, *be accounted ignorant of what plain* Scripture *or* Tradition *delivered touching a Matter of Faith of so great Import to the Union, the Peace and Reformation of the* Church, *and why then may not others be ignorant of other Matters plain in* Scripture, *or* Tradition, *without Peril? why may we not suppose, or at the least, suspect, That other* Councils, *less numerous, have been so?*

Again, These Councils *of* Constance, *and* Basil *have declared and decreed, That* (a) general Councils have Authority immediately from Christ, which every one, of whatsoever State or Dignity, though it be Papal, is obliged to obey in things pertaining to Faith, the Extirpation of the said Schism, and the general Reformation of the Church in its Head and Members. *That* the Pope himself is bound to stand to the Declaration and Definition of these Councils. Whatsoever Christian, *saith the* (b) Council *of* Constance, refuseth to profess, That he believes, asserts and holds this, he shall be proceeded against, as one suspected of Heresy. *This, saith the* Council *of* Basil, *is* (c) *Veritas fidei Catholicæ*, A Truth belonging to the Catholick Faith, and whosoever pertinaciously resists it, *censendus est Hæreticus*, Is to be deemed an Heretick. It is an Article of Faith which cannot be neglected, *say they, Sine interitu salutis*, Without the Loss of Salvation. *They also decreed, That* it was not in the Power of the Pope to dissolve, prorogue, or transfer a general Council to another place, without

(a) *Concil. Basil. Sess. 2. apud Bin. To. 8. p. 22. Sess. 18. p. 55.*

(b) *Sess. 45.*

(c) *Sess. 33. p. 95.*

without the Consent of the said Council. *And this* Decree *is also stiled* (a) An Article of Faith, which he who pertinaciously doth resist is to be deemed an Heretick. *They also urge in Confirmation of these Decrees,* (a) *Ibid. Sess.* 33. p. 59. & *Sess.* 38. p. 101.

1. *That they were established by* Martin *the* Fifth, *confirming the* Decrees *of the* Council *of* Constance, *and by* Eugenius *the* Fourth, *confirming that of* Basil, *and particularly that of the Eighth Session, That* (b) during that Council, there could be no general Council assembled elsewhere, *and that* if any one presumed to make or erect another Assembly under the Name of a general Council, he would not erect a Council of the Church Catholick, but a Conventicle of Schismaticks. (b) P. 33.

Secondly. *That by Virtue of these* Decrees (c) *Martin* the Fifth was chosen Pope, *and John* the Twenty third, *and Benedict* the Thirteenth were deposed, and that after the Death of *Martin* the Fifth, *Eugenius* the Fourth was chosen Pope by virtue of the same Decrees. So that if they were not valid, these neither could be true Popes, nor the Cardinals, Arch-Bishops, or other Clerks promoted by them could have good Titles to these Promotions. (c) *Sess.* 29. p. 83. p. 101.

Thirdly. *That* (d) if the Pope had the Authority over general Councils, which these Decrees denied to belong to him, the Pope might without Resistance, at his Pleasure, corrupt all Christianity, and being accused by a Council of Heresy, or any other Crime, might presently dissolve the Council to escape being judged by them. (d) *Sess.* 30. p. 84. *v. p.* 138, 139, 178.

Fourthly. *That* (e) no skilful Person ever doubted of this Article, That the Pope was subject to the Judgment of Universal Councils in things which concern the Faith. *That* (f) the Universal Church, and Christian Religion acquiesced in this Article of Faith, *Firmiter credens non posse fieri dissolutionem Synodi sine consensu ejus,* Firmly believing, that a Dissolution of the Council could not be made without its Consent. (g) That it was by all confessed. (e) *Decret.* 5. *Concil. p.* 117. (f) P. 153, 155, 180. (g) P. 149.

Fifthly. *That* (h) if these Decrees were not to be admitted, it must follow, that all these Councils had actually erred, and that they who were Members of them, were schismaticks, *and that the Church which judged that they could not be dissolved without their own Consent, hath also erred.* (h) P. 136, 139.

Now, I say, were these truly Articles of Faith, or not? If they

were, why are they not received by the Church of Rome? Yea why are they rejected by the greatest part of (o) Romish Doctors? Why were they practically condemned by the Council of Florence assembling in opposition to one of these Articles? And why is not that Council held by the Church of Rome Schismatical, as it must have been, if the fore-mentioned Decrees be true? Why were they dogmatically Condemned in the Fifth Council of Lateran?

(o) Concilii Basilienſis nihil eſt ratum & probatum niſi quædam diſpoſitiones. Bell. de Concil. l. 1. c. 7.

If they were not Articles of Faith, why were they owned as such by ſo many Councils, ſo many Nations, ſo many Univerſities? Why doth the General Council of Baſil ſo frequently inſiſt upon

P. 89. this plea in defence of them, that they were determinations, *Univerſæ Eccleſiæ*, of the Univerſal Church, that they had been

P. 153. declared in many Councils, *atque per Univerſalem Eccleſiam approbatæ*, and approved by the Univerſal Church? That,

P. 155. *tota Eccleſia, & populus Chriſtianus*, the whole Church, and all Chriſtian People had acquieſced in them. That they were

P. 180. Declarations of the Catholick Faith, *quas univerſa tenuit Eccleſia*, which the Univerſal Church held. May we not here turn all the Arguments of the Romaniſts upon them, by which they do endeavour to ſhew that 'tis in us unreaſonable, abſurd, and inſolent to condemn the Decrees of their ſuppoſed General Councils, and of theſe two in particular, decreeing for the Subſtraction of the Cup? May we not complain of them in the words of the Council of Baſil,

P. 117. that refuſing to follow, as an infallible Rule, the Doctrine of the Catholick Church in things reſpecting Faith, *judicium proprium in adverſum obduratis animis ſequi volunt*, they chuſe on the contrary with obdurate minds to follow their *Private Judgment*? May we not ask them in the words of the ſame Council, Whether they dare condemn all the Cardinals, Patriarchs, Biſhops, the Emperor, the Kings, the Princes and others, who by themſelves or others were preſent in this Council;

P. 149. *& denique Eccleſiam per orbem diſperſam hoc Concilium approbantem*, and laſtly the Church diſperſed throughout the World approving this Council? May we not argue thus with them, If thoſe Declarations of Faith and Divine Right, which have ſo oft and ſolemnly been made by the Univerſal Church, and by General Councils declared conſiſtorially to be lawful by the Popes

P. 179. themſelves, even at the very time that they made them: *Si poſt hæc omnia*; If, *I ſay*, after all theſe things, theſe Declarations may be rejected and trampled upon, as being erroneous,

muſt

must not the whole Church be accuſed of Error, and the Declarations of General Councils touching matters of Faith be henceforth disbelieved? *Yea laſtly may we not conclude with* R. H. *in a like caſe*, (p) *That* if the Decrees of ſo many Synods, (*viz. at* Piſa, Conſtance, Sens, Baſil, Bourges) ſo often weighing the Adverſaries Reaſons and Evidences, was not ſufficient for ſetling ſuch a point, at leaſt as to the obedience of future ſilence and non-contradiction, and as to ſuffering the Church to enjoy her Peace; what can hereafter be ſufficient; or can we ever hope that any Controverſie ſhall be finally determined, or ended by a future Council, if this (*of the Superiority of a General Council above a Pope*, &c.) is not by theſe forepaſt? Can there be any Ground here to queſtion the integrity or lawful proceedings of ſo many Councils all concurring in the ſame Judgment in this matter? or could there be any new Light in this Point attainable by private Doctors, or by following Councils of the Church of *Rome*, of which thoſe Councils were not capable or had no notice of, *whatſoever* R. H. *elſewhere ſpeaks of*, (q) A moral certainty, that ſo many and ſuch perſons as meet in their ſuppoſed General Councils, could not conſpire to falſifie the Truth, *That* (r) none can be ſuppoſed fit to judge of them, *That* (s) Men vainly pretend to be certain of what ſuch Councils, and a major part of the Church, having the ſame means of certainty, judge falſe, or that their private Judgments can have clear Scripture or Tradition, which they could not diſcern, *I ſay, All theſe things in this inſtance do ſo viſibly recoil upon them, that it is needleſs to inſiſt upon it.*

(p) *Rat. accoum Diſc.* 1. *ch.* 6. §. 59. *p.* 58.

(q) *Diſc.* 1. *c.* 3. §. 37, 38. *p.* 26.

(r) *Diſc.* 3. §. 44. *p.* 28.

(s) P. 143, 179.

Laſtly, Two things I deſire may be conſidered and attended to in peruſing this Diſcourſe.

The First *is, That though the* Ancients *alledged here, directly oppoſe the Doctrines and Determinations of theſe* Councils, *and the Practice of the* Church *of* Rome *eſtabliſhed by them; yet do I not for that Reaſon only conclude her guilty of Sin and Error in denying the Cup to the Laity, for I am far from holding every thing taught or practiſed by the* Ancients, *as certainly true and neceſſary, and therefore fear not any Retortions of this Nature, from our* Adverſaries: *Had I deſigned any thing of that Nature, I would more copiouſly have inſiſted on thoſe Arguments from Scripture, whence that concluſion can alone be made, and which I therefore have ſo briefly touched upon,*

upon, because I was so happily prevented in that matter by the unanswerable Treatise on this Subject against the Bishop of Meaux, *with which I was unwilling to interfere; but finding that the forementioned* Bishop *had with great confidence appealed for this matter, to the* constant practice *and to the* Principles *of the* Primitive
P. 160, 161. Church, *and told us, That* the constant Practices of the Primitive Church received with universal approbation from the Origin of Christianity, till the time of the Council of *Constance*, do invincibly demonstrate, that the Council did but follow the *Tradition of All Ages* when it defined, That the Communion under one kind was as good and sufficient as under both, *with many other things of a like nature, in which he is also followed by the late Writers of the same Communion: And finding also that the once exploded* Blackloists *were again admitted to plead the infallibility of the* Roman Church *from* practical Tradition, *and that this was done upon the strength of these two Propositions:*

J. S. 1. *That* the Church of *Rome* hath always held close to Tradition, and received still her Doctrine by Tradition from the Father to the Son, from the first to the second, and so to the present Age.

2. *That* she could not mistake the sense of Tradition in particular points. *In contradiction to these confident Assertions I have here shewed, by confronting the Doctrines and Sayings of the* Fathers, *to the express Determinations of their* Councils.

1. *That the present* Church *of* Rome *hath varied in this matter from* Antiquity, *both in Doctrine and Practice, and that* Tradition *plainly contradicts all their Assertions and Decrees relating to it: And therefore that all her late* Defenders *are much mistaken, or, which is worse, would lead others into a known Error, when they undertake to perswade them that the practice of their* Church, *in denying the Cup to the* Laity *and to* Priests non-conficient, *is warranted by Tradition and Primitive Practice, and by the* Principles *on which they builded that pretended Practice.*

2. *That in this* particular Point *she hath either actually mistaken the Sence of* Tradition, *or actually deviated from* Tradition. *And seeing whether she does now differ from or agree with the* Primitive *Belief, and Practice in this* Article, *is a matter of* Fact, *and so may be determined by the Testimony of good* Witnesses *of what was practised and believed in their Times, and by plain Allegations of matter of* Fact, *without* Infallibility: *In plain reason, and from*

her

her own avowed Principles it follows, that her Authority in saying she does not differ from the Tradition *of the* Ancients, *and much more in asserting, That she hath always held to it, and therefore could not mistake the Sence of it, can be of no force against plain evidence of* Fact *to the contrary. If then the difference betwixt the Belief and Practice of the* Ancients, *and of the* present Church *of* Rome *in this matter be evident, as I think I have made it, it must be owned that the present received Tradition of that* Church *can be no certain Rule of Truth, and no sure Argument that such was the Tradition of the* Primitive Church, *since in this Controversie she hath actually varied from the Tradition of the* Ancients.

And thus far, 1. *and no farther, would I be thought to drive the Argument drawn from the Citations of the* Ancients. *The Right or* Authority *claimed by that* Church, *will be best judged of by other* Intrinsick Arguments, *which ought to have the greater force when it appears that* Prescription *is against our* Adversaries. *Only I cannot but admire why the* Trent Council *should found their Power of making such a Change in our* Lord's *Institution, on those words of the* Apostle, 1 *Cor.* iv. 1 (*t*) But let a Man account of us, ὡς ὑπηρέτας χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ, & dispensatores mysteriorum Dei, as Ministers of Christ, and Stewards of the Mysteries of God. *Since in that very place it is immediately added, That* of a Steward it is required that he be found Faithful, *that is, saith* (u) Chrysostom, *that* he do not usurp Authority over the things of his Lord, but administer them as a Steward, οἰκονόμου γὰρ τὸ διοικεῖν τὰ ἐγχειρισθέντα καλῶς, for it belongeth to a Steward to administer, *or distribute,* well to the Family the things committed to his hands. *And St.* Basil (x) *saith,* It is the property of a faithful Minister, whatsoever things are commited to him by his Lord, to distribute them to his fellow Servants, and to preserve them for him, without Adulteration or Deceit, *or purely and* entirely, *saith the* Latin.

(t) *Id autem Apostolus non obscure visus est innuisse cum ait, sic nos existimet,* &c. Sess. 21. c. 2.

(u) Ἵνα μὴ ὡς Δεσπότης ἑαυτῷ ἐκδικῇ ἀλλ' ὡς οἰκονόμος διοικῇ. In Locum.

(x) Εἰς τοὺς συνδούλους οἰκονομῆσαι ταῦτα διασῶσαι τούτοις ἀνοθεύτως καὶ ἀκαπηλεύτως. Hæc ipsis integra custodiat, Tom. 2. de vera ac pia fide p. 385. *b.*

2. *The* Second *thing which I desire may be considered, is, That nothing in the following Citations can be urged against the* Church *of* England, *as Erroneous in this Matter. For since she professeth* Art. 6.

to

to admit nothing as necessary to be believed, *but what is either expressed in, or fairly deducible from* Scripture, *and that* it is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly alike: *How can it reflect upon her, that S.* Cyprian, *for Example, held it necessary* to mix the Wine with Water, *or that others have held it necessary to use* Unleavened Bread, &c. *All that her* Sons *are in this Case obliged to, is only to give fair and satisfactory Reasons, why these things are not necessary, which they are both able and willing to do; whereas if a disagreement between the* present Church *of* Rome, *and the* Primitive Christians *be once proved against them in any of their* Articles, *all their fine Pleas for the certainty of their* Traditions, *the* Infallibility *of their* Councils, as proceeding upon Tradition, *and* meeting only to consult about the Tradition of the Church diffused, *and all the* Prejudices *they advance against the* Protestants *from the present* Tradition *of their* Church, *must be confessedly vain and* Sophistical. *And the attending to this difference of* Principles *in each* Church, *will shew how much the Testimonies of the* Ancients *do affect the one, and how little they concern the other, and so will prevent the Objections of an Unwary, and the Cavils of a captious Reader.*

Art. 34.

Mr. *M.* Queſt. of Queſt. p. 395, 396, 397.

THE

THE INTRODUCTION.

Shewing what the Councils of Conſtance, Baſil, *and* Trent *have determined, touching Communion in one kind.*

THOUGH in many other Doctrines, and Practices of the *Church* of *Rome*, ſhe contradicteth the plaineſt Evidence of *Scripture* and *Tradition*, as in the *bowing down to Images*, the *Celebration* of the *Maſs* in *Latin*, where it is a Tongue *unknown* to the Generality of them that hear it; yet in none of them hath ſhe ſo openly affronted, and defied both the Inſtitutions of the *H. Scripture*, and the continual Practice, and declaration of the *Church* of *Chriſt*, as in her practice of the *Subſtraction* of the *Cup* from *Lay Communicants*; and in the Propoſitions, Aſſertions, and Decrees, ſhe hath eſtabliſhed to excuſe that practice.

In that of *Honorary Worſhip* of the *Images* of *Saints*, her ſecond *Nicene Council* doth very frequently, though, ſay the *Fathers* met at *Frankford* *, very *impudently*, pretend to *Apoſtolical Tradition*. The *Trent Council* uſher in their *Decree* concerning the *Honour* and *Veneration* to be imparted to them, with an inſinuation, that it is made *juxta Catholicæ, & Apoſtolicæ Eccleſiæ uſum, à primævis Chriſtianæ Religionis temporibus receptum* †: *According to the uſe of the Catholick and Apoſtolick Church, received from the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity*. But when they come to ſettle *as a Law* this *Defalcation* of the *Cup*, they do it without any of theſe colours, or pretences, yea with confeſſed deviation both from our *Saviour*'s Inſtitution and *Tradition*, and from the conſtant practice of the firſt, and pureſt Ages of his *Church*. Declaring, and defining, as the *Trent Council* doth, That (*a*) *although*

* Præfat. p. 10.

† *Seſſ.* 25.

(*a*) *Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 1, 2.

though our Redeemer, and our Lord, in his Laſt Supper did inſtitute this venerable Sacrament, and deliver it to the Apoſtles in both ſpecies, yet (b) if any perſon ſay the Holy Catholick Church was not by juſt cauſes and reaſons moved to give it to the Laity, and Prieſts not conſecrating, in one ſpecies only, let him be accurſed. And as the Council of *Conſtance* doth, That * *although in the Primitive Church the Sacrament was received by the Faithful under both ſpecies, yet is the Cuſtom of receiving it by Lay-Men, and by Prieſts not conſecrating, to be received as a Law.*

(b) *Ibid.* Can. 2.

* Quod licet in primitiva Eccleſia hujuſmodi Sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus ſub utraq; ſpecie, tamen hæc conſuetudo, *viz.* communicandi Laicos, tantummodo ſub ſpecie panis habenda eſt pro lege quam non licet reprobare. *Concil. Conſtant. Seſſ.* 13.

That theſe *Decrees* are evidently repugnant to the inſtitution of our *Lord* and *Saviour*, and to the practice of the whole *Church* of *Chriſt*, for above a Thouſand Years, hath been proved beyond all poſſibility of contradiction, in a late excellent Treatiſe, in Anſwer to a Diſcourſe of Mr. *Condom* on this Subject. That the ſame *Decrees*, and almoſt every propoſition, declaration, and aſſertion, which have been advanced, and invented by the *General Councils* of *Conſtance*, *Baſil*, and of *Trent*, in favour of them, are manifeſtly oppoſite and repugnant to the received *Traditions* of the *Church* of *Chriſt*, and to the Sence and the Expreſſions of the *Fathers* of the *Chriſtian Church*, I undertake, by God's Aſſiſtance, in the enſuing Pages to demonſtrate, by ſhewing,

Firſt, What theſe *Councils* have determined in this matter. And,

Secondly, What hath, in contradiction to them, been aſſerted, and declared by the *Fathers* which flouriſhed in the *Church* of God.

Now the *Church* of *Rome* hath by the *Councils* of *Conſtance*, *Baſil* and *Trent*, declared and defined as followeth.

1. Firſt, (c) *That the Laicks and Prieſts, who do not conſecrate, are not obliged by divine Precept to receive the Sacrament in both kinds.* That (d) *though Chriſt, in his Laſt Supper, inſtituted this venerable Sacrament under the ſpecies of Bread and Wine, yet do not that inſtitution and delivery, bind all the Faithful, by the Law of Chriſt, to receive both ſpecies; and that they who aſſert the contrary, ſpeak raſhly and preſumptuouſly.*

(c) Sancta Synodus declarat, & docet nullo divino præcepto Laicos & Clericos, non conficientes obligari ad Euchariſtiæ Sacramentum ſub utraq; ſpecie ſumendum. *Sym. Trid. Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 1.

(d) Et *cap.* 3.

2. That

2. That (*e*) *it cannot be doubted, without prejudice to the Christian Faith, but that Communion in one kind only is ſufficient to Salvation.* Whoſoever doth affirm the contrary to either of theſe Declarations, ſaith the *Trent Council*, *let him be Anathema.*

(*e*) Neque ullo pacto dubitari poſſe, ſalva fide, quin illis alterius ſpeciei communio ad ſalutem ſufficiat. *Ibid.* Et *Seſſ.* 13. *Can.* 3.

3. That (*f*) *the Church of Chriſt, for juſt and weighty reaſons, hath approved the Communion of Laicks and Prieſts not conſecrating, under one kind only, and hath defined it for a Law, That* (*g*) *although Chriſt himſelf did miniſter this venerable Sacrament to his Diſciples in both kinds, the ſpecies of Bread and Wine; and though it was ſo received by the Faithful in the Primitive Church, yet the contrary Cuſtom that the Prieſts, who do conſecrate, ſhould receive in both kinds, and the Laity ſhould receive only the ſpecies of Bread, was rationally introduced, and is to be received as a Law, which none muſt change or reject at his pleaſure, without the Authority of the Church.*

(*f*) Sancta mater Eccleſia — gravibus & juſtis cauſis adducta, hanc conſuetudinem ſub altera ſpecie communicandi approbavit, & pro lege habendum decrevit, quam reprobare, aut ſine Eccleſiæ authoritate pro libito mutare non licet. *Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* 21. *c.* 2.

(*g*) Concilium S. Generale Conſtantienſe in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregatum, declarat, decernit & definit, quod licet Chriſtus poſt cœnam inſtituerit, & ſuis Diſcipulis adminiſtraverit ſub utraq; ſpecie panis & vini hoc venerabile Sacramentum — & ſimiliter, quod licet in primitiva Eccleſia hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus ſub utraq; ſpecie, tamen hæc conſuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula & ſcandala eſt rationabiliter introducta quod a conficientibus ſub utraq; ſpecie, & a Laicis tantummodo ſub ſpecie panis ſuſcipiatur, unde cum hujuſmodi conſuetudo ab Eccleſia, & Sanctis Patribus rationabiliter introducta, & *diuiſſime* obſervata ſit, habenda eſt pro lege quam non licet reprobare, aut ſine Eccleſiæ authoritate pro libitu mutare. *Concil. Conſtant. Seſſ.* 13.

4. That *to ſay that it is* (*h*) *Sacrilegious, or unlawful to obſerve this Law or Cuſtom, is to be deemed Erroneous, and they who pertinaciouſly do ſo aſſert, are to be puniſhed, and driven from the Church as Hereticks, they acting damnably who endeavour to reprove this cuſtom as Sacrilegious.* That (*i*) *if any Prieſt communicates the People under both kinds, he is to be excommunicated, and proceſs is to be di-*

(*h*) Quapropter dicere hanc conſuetudinem aut legem obſervare ſit ſacrilegum aut illicitum, cenſeri debet erroneum, & pertinaciter aſſerentes oppoſitum præmiſſorum tanquam Hæretici arcendi ſunt, & graviter puniendi. *Ibid.*

(*i*) Quod nullus Presbyter ſub pœna excommunicationis, communicet populum ſub utraq; ſpecie panis & vini. Item ipſa Sancta Synodus decernit & declarat ſuper iſta materia, ut effectualiter puniant eos contra hoc decretum excedentes, qui communicando populum ſub utraq; ſpecie panis & vini exhortati fuerint, & ſic faciendum eſſe docuerint, & ſi ad pœnitentiam redire non curaverint, animo indurato, per cenſuras Eccleſiaſticas per eos ut Hæretici ſunt coercendi. *Ibid.*

rected by the Authority of the General Council of Constance to all Patriarchs, Primates, Arch-bishops, Bishops, and their Vicars in Spirituals, commanding them under the penalty of Excommunication, that they effectually punish those, who, contrary to this Decree, exhort the People to Communicate in both kinds of Bread and Wine, and take upon them so to minister the Sacrament unto them, and to deal with them as Hereticks, if they continue obstinately without Repentance in so doing. Yea the Trent Council hath pronounced an Anathema upon all those (k) who shall say she was not moved by just Causes and Reasons to make this Law, that non-conficient Priests and Laicks should communicate in Bread alone, or in that species only, or that she erred in making of that Law.

(k) Si quis dixerit Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam non justis causis & rationibus adductam fuisse ut Laicos, atque etiam Clericos non conficientes, sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse, Anathema sit. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 21. *Can.* 2.

5. That (l) though Christ instituted this Sacrament in both kinds, and so delivered it to his Apostles, yet must it be confessed, that whole, and entire Christ, and a true Sacrament is received under one kind only, and that therefore, as to the benefit of the Sacrament, they are not deprived of any Grace necessary to Salvation, who receive one kind only; yea, that it is most true, that as much is contained under either species, as under both, for whole Christ is under the species of Bread, and under every part of it; under the species of Wine, and every particle of it.

(l) Insuper declarat, Quamvis Redemptor noster in suprema illa cœna hoc Sacramentum in duabus speciebus instituerit, & Apostolis tradiderit, tamen fatendum esse etiam sub altera tantum specie totum atque integrum Christum, verumque Sacramentum sumi, ac propterea, quod ad fructum attinet, nulla gratia necessaria ad salutem eos defraudari, qui unam speciem solam accipiunt. *Concil. Trid. Sess* 21. *Cap.* 3. Si quis negaverit in venerabili Sacramento Eucharistiæ sub unaquaque specie & sub singulis cujusque speciei partibus, separatione facta, totum Christum contineri, Anathema sit. *Sess.* 13. *Can.* 3.

6. That (m) by force of the natural Connexion and Concomitance, which is betwixt the parts of Christ's raised Body, Christ's Body is under the species of Wine, and his Blood under the species of Bread; and so whole Christ under each species, and every particle of them, it being firmly to be believed, and in no wise doubted, that the whole Body and Blood of Christ is contained as well under the species of Bread, as under that of Wine, and not the Flesh only under the

(m) Nullatenus ambigendum est, quod non sub specie panis caro tantum, nec sub specie vini sanguis tantum, sed sub qualibet specie est integer totus Christus. *Concil. Bas. Sess.* 30. *Concil. Constant. Sess.* 13. Vi naturalis illius connexionis & concomitantiæ, qua partes Christi Domini — inter se copulantur. *Concil. Trid. Sess.* 13. *Cap.* 3

species

ſpecies of Bread, nor the Blood only under the ſpecies of Wine; and (*n*) this *whoſoever ſhall deny*, ſaith the *Trent Council*, *let him be Anathema.*

(*n*) Si quis negaverit in Sanctiſſimæ Euchariſtiæ Sacramento contineri vere, realiter & ſubſtantialiter corpus, & ſanguinem, una cum anima & divinitate Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, ac proinde totum Chriſtum — Anathema ſit. *Ibid. Can.* 1.

7. That no man muſt dare hereafter (*o*) *to preach, teach or believe otherwiſe than is by theſe Decrees explained and defined.* Theſe are the *Doctrines*, *Decrees*, and *Definitions* of theſe *Councils*, and how extreamly oppoſite they are unto the formerly received Doctrines of the Church of Chriſt, and to the plain Aſſertions of the *Ancient Fathers*, ſhall be my buſineſs in the enſuing Sections to demonſtrate.

(*o*) Cunctis Chriſti fidelibus interdicit, ne poſthac de iis aliter *vel credere*, vel docere, vel prædicare audeant, quam ex his decretis explicatum atque definitum. *Conc. Trid. Seſſ.* 21. *Cap.* 1. *Seſſ.* 13. *præfat.*

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

The Contents.

Shewing in oppoſition to the decrees of the Councils of Conſtance, Baſil *and* Trent, *that the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, till the 12th. Century, taught, that the Laity by divine precept were obliged to receive both ſpecies, which is proved from the Teſtimonies of* Juſtin Martyr, *Cent.* 2. §. 1. *Of* Cyprian, *Cent.* 3. §. 2. *Of* Baſil, Ambroſe, *and the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions, Cent.* 4. §. 3. *Of* Chryſoſtome *and St.* Auſtin, *Cent.* 5. §. 4. *Of* Cæſarius Arelatenſis, *and* Procopius Gazæus, *Cent.* 6. §. 5. *Of* Iſidore Hiſpalenſis, *and the Council of* Braga, *Cent.* 7. §. 6. *Of venerable* Bede, *Cent.* 8. §. 7. *Of* Hincmarus Remenſis *and* Paſchaſius, *Cent.* 9. §. 8. *Of* Lanfrank *and* Anſelme, *Cent.* 11. §. 9. *Of* Paſchal, Hugo de Sancto Victore, Arnoldus Carnotenſis, *St.* Bernard, *and* Rupertus Taitienſis, *Cent.* 12. §. 10. *Of* Albertus Magnus, *Cent.* 13. §. 11. *Five Corollaries from the Doctrine of the Fathers in this Point*, §. 12.

§. 1.

(a) Sancta Synodus declarat & docet nullo divino præcepto Laicos & Clericos non conficientes obligari ad Euchariſtiæ Sacramentum ſub utraque ſpecie ſumendum. *Seſſ.* 21. *Cap.* 1. *Concil. Conſt. Seſſ.* 13.

FIRST then whereas the *Councils* of *Conſtance*, *Baſil* and (a) *Trent* have declared, defined and determined, That *the Faithful Laity and the Clergy that do not conſecrate, are not obliged by divine precept to receive the Sacrament of the Euchariſt in both the ſpecies of Bread and Wine.* The *Fathers* do, in oppoſition to this Doctrine, either expreſly, or by plain conſequence aſſert that the *Laity*, as well as *Prieſts*, by divine precept, are obliged to receive the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper* in both kinds, and that the precept, *drink ye all of this*, was by our *Lord* directed, *as well to Lay-men as to Prieſts.* *Juſtin Martyr*, in his Second *Apology*, relates the practice of the *Chriſtians* thus, *After the Preſident hath given thanks, and all the People ſaid* Amen, (b) *the Deacons give to every perſon preſent to participate of the Bread, Wine and Water, which are bleſſed, and this food we call the Euchariſt, which none but he that believeth our Doctrine, and is Baptized can receive.* And to ſhew us that he did not look upon this

(b) Οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, pag. 97.

this practice as an arbitrary thing, he adds, That (c) *the Blessed Apostles in their Gospels had delivered that Christ commanded them so to do*; for, *he having taken Bread, and given thanks, is by them declared to have said, Do this in remembrance of me, this is my Body; and also when he had taken the Cup, and given thanks, to have said, This is my Blood, and to have given it to them alone.* Where note first, that *Justin Martyr* speaks here of a *command* of Christ, which cannot possibly relate unto the *consecration*, but to the *participation* of the Elements, the command being, *Do this, Take, eat, Drink ye all of this.* Secondly, he had said before that, *only* (d) *Believers did communicate*; this he now proves, because Christ delivered the Elements *to them alone*, commanding them to partake of them. He therefore clearly speaks of delivering the Bread and Wine to the Communicants: Moreover speaking of the service performed by *Christians* on the *Lord's* Day, he saith, *Prayers being finished, we offer Bread, Wine and Water, and the President gives thanks and Praise, and the People say Amen; and there is made a Distribution of those things which have been consecrated, and every one partakes of them*; and then he thus concludes, That (e) *Christ rising upon this day, appeared, and taught those things which we have now laid before your Eyes.* He therefore must have taught, according to *Justin Martyr*, the distribution of the Bread and Wine to every Communicant. Here then observe to the confusion of the *Trent Council*, First, That it was the *Tradition* of the *Apostles* that Christ *commanded*, that the Eucharist under both kinds, should be given to every one present at the Sacrament, and that the distribution of those things which were consecrated, so that *every one should partake of them*, is that which *Christ* taught. Secondly, That they declared that Christ gave this commandment in his *Gospels*, whence it is evident, that the *Apostles*, and all the Christians of their times, and of the times of *Justin Martyr*, did interpret the Institution of the Sacrament by Christ, as a *command*, that every faithful Person present should partake both of the consecrated Bread and Cup, and that both should be distributed to them.

(c) Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδοσαν ἐντετάχθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, p. 98.

(d) Ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία, ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μεταλαβεῖν ἔξον ἐστίν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι, &c. p. 97. τ. μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδίδται, p. 98.

P. 98.

(e) Ἐδίδαξε ταῦτα ἅπερ εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν καὶ ὑμῖν ἀνεδόθη, p. 99. B.

St.

§. 2. St. *Cyprian* in his *Epistle* to *Cecilian* complains of some, who *out of Ignorance, or Simplicity, in sanctifying of the Cup of the Lord, and* (*f*) in the Ministration of it to the People, *did not that which Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, the Author and Teacher of that Sacrifice, did and taught, because they used only Water, and mixed not Wine with it in the Cup they consecrated, and distributed among the People.* Where note that this they did not out of any prophane Opinion of the Wickedness of drinking Wine, as the *Aquarii*, and *Encratitæ*, and the *Tatiani* did, but only out of *Ignorance and Simplicity*, and therefore he informs us, That they did this only in their *morning Sacrifice*, that the *Heathens* might not conclude that they were *Christians*, and so hale them away to *Martyrdom, because they smell'd of Wine:* And that (*g*) *in their evening Sacrifice* they *offered a Cup mixt*, according to Custom. Now against this humane and novel Custom he argues,

(*f*) In calice Domini sanctificando & plebi ministrando. *Ep.* 63. *ed. Oxon. p.* 148.

(*g*) Cum ad cœnandum venimus mixtum calicem offerimus. *p.* 155, 156.

First, From the Custom of (*h*) *most Bishops in the Church of Christ*; *Who*, says he, *keep to the evangelical Truth, and the Tradition of our Lord, and do not, by any new and humane Institution, recede from that which Christ our Master hath commanded and performed.* Whence it is evident, that in the Judgment of St. *Cyprian*, Christ both *commanded*, That the Cup mixed with Water should be *administred to the People*, and did so administer it.

(*h*) Quanquam sciam Episcopos plurimos Ecclesiis Dominicis in *toto mundo* divina dignatione præpositos Evangelicæ veritatis ac *dominicæ traditionis* tenere rationem, nec ab eo quod Christus magister & præcepit & gessit, humana & novella institutione decedere. *Ibid. p.* 148.

Secondly, From the Necessity of obeying Christ's Institution, and Command; for saith he, (*i*) *I thought it both Religious and Necessary to write these Letters to you, That, if any be yet held under this Error, seeing the Light of the Truth, they may return to the Root and Original of the Tradition of our Lord.*—— *For when any thing is* injoined *by the Inspiration and Command of God, it is necessary that the Faithful Servant should obey his Lord, and he will be excused of all Men, That he arrogantly assumeth nothing to himself, who is compelled to fear the Anger of the Lord, if he do not what he hath commanded.* St. *Cyprian* therefore did believe that Christ required, That the Cup, offered in Remembrance of him, should

(*i*) Religiosum pariter & necessarium duxi has ad vos literas facere, ut siquis in isto errore adhuc teneatur, veritatis luce perspecta ad radicem atque originem *traditionis dominicæ* revertatur—— Quando aliquid Deo inspirante & mandante præcipitur, necesse est domino servus fidelis obtemperet, excusatus apud omnes quod nihil sibi arroganter assumat qui offensam domini timere compellitur nisi faciat quod *jubetur. ib.*

ſhould be mixed with Wine and Water; and being thus offered, ſhould be diſtributed to the People; and that he who did not ſo Adminiſter, did *arrogantly aſſume unto himſelf*, and had juſt Cauſe *to fear the Indignation of his Lord.*

Thirdly. This he proves alſo from the Exhortation and Command of Wiſdom; * *Come, eat of my Bread, and drink of the Wine that I have mingled*: Where by mixed Wine, *the Cup of the Lord mixed with Wine and Water, is*, ſaith he, *prophetically ſpoken of*; adding, That *we could not drink the Blood of Chriſt, had not He firſt been preſſed, and trampled upon*; and, (*k*) *had not he firſt drunk the Cup in which he drunk to Believers.* Moreover, *as Chriſt*, ſaith he, *commanded the Water of eternal Life to be given to Believers in Baptiſm*; *ſo alſo by the Example of his Maſterſhip, he taught the Cup was to be mingled with Wine and Water: For about the Day of his Paſſion taking the Cup, He bleſſed it, and gave to his Diſciples*; *ſaying, Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Teſtament which is ſhed for many for the Remiſſion of Sins.*——*And the Apoſtle* Paul *ſaith, the Lord Jeſus, the ſame Night in which he was betrayed took Bread, and giving Thanks, he brake it, and ſaid, This is my Body which ſhall be delivered for you, do this in Remembrance of me*; *likewiſe, after Supper, he took the Cup, ſaying, This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood*; *this do, as oft as you drink it, in Remembrance of me*; *for as oft as you eat this Bread and drink this Cup, yow ſhew the Lords Death till he come. Now*, ſaith he, (*l*) *if it be* commanded *by our Lord, and the ſame thing be confirmed, and delivered by his Apoſtle, That as oft as we drink in Commemoration of our Lord, we ſhould do that which our Lord did*; *we find that is not obſerved by us which is commanded, unleſs we do the ſame things which our Lord did, and mingling the Cup of the Lord after the ſame manner, we recede not from the divine Inſtitution.*

* *Prov.* ix. 5.

(*k*) Niſi Chriſtus calicem prior biberet in quo credentibus propinaret. *p.* 150.

(*l*) Quod ſi a Domino præcipitur N. B. & ab Apoſtolo ejus hoc idem confirmatur & traditur, ut quotiescunque biberimus in Commemorationem Domini hæc faciamus quod fecit & Dominus, invenimus non obſervari a nobis quod mandatum eſt, niſi eadem quæ dominus fecit, nos quoque faciamus. *p.* 152.

Laſtly. *If any of our Predeceſſors*, ſaith he, *out of Ignorance, or Simplicity, did not hold, and obſerve that* (*m*) *which the Lord taught us to do by his Example, and* command; *Gods Mercy may ſhew Pardon to him, whereas no Pardon will be ſhewed to us, being inſtructed and admoniſhed to offer, as our Lord did, his Cup mixed with Wine, if we do not ſo. Wherefore we have directed*

(*m*)—Quod nos dominus facere exemplo & Magiſterio ſuo docuit, &c. *p.* 156, 157.

Letters to all our Colleagues, That the evangelical Command, *and the Tradition of our Lord, should be every where observed, and that there should be no receding from that which Christ both taught and did.*

Here then is all that *Protestants* assert against the Definitions of the *Councils* of *Constance*, *Basil* and *Trent*, *viz.*

1. That our *Lord* taught both by Example, and *command* the Ministration of the Cup, or that this was enjoined *by Inspiration and* Command *of God*.

2. That *Christ* in ministring the Cup *drank to Believers*, and, That *he commanded them to drink it*, by saying, *Drink ye all of this*; and that the same thing is confirmed by the *Apostle*, *saying*, *This do, as oft as you drink it, in Remembrance of me.*

3. That this *evangelical Command*, and *Tradition* of *Christ* is to be every where observed, and that none should recede from what he did *both teach and do*, none should recede from the *divine Institution*; that it is necessary that *the Faithful Servant should obey his Lord*, and that he may justly fear his Anger if he do not what he hath commanded.

Now that St. *Cyprian* in this *Epistle* speaks not only of the *Consecration*, or *Oblation* of the *Cup*, but also of the *Distribution* of it, and the *Participation* of it by the *People*, is evident beyond all Contradiction. For,

1. He expressly speaks of sanctifying the Lords Cup, and *ministring it to the People*. N. B. and of the Blood of the Lord (*n*) *drink off by them*; and of the Cup which in the *Psalmist's* Phrase, *inebriates the Drinkers of it.*

(*n*) Epist. Sanguine Domini. p. 153.

2. He adds, that some perhaps might plead in favour of that Practice, he condemns, That they used only Water, least their Persecutors, *perceiving that they smelled of Wine in the Morning*, might hence conclude, they had received the Sacrament, and gather thence that they were *Christians*; which could by no means be objected, if he argued only for the *Consecration* of Wine, and not for the *Participation* of it by *Believers also*, seeing they could not smell of that which they did not partake of.

3. He saith, That *if the fear of smelling of Wine should keep* p. 155. *Men from doing what Christ did, and commanded to be done in commemoration of himself, the Brotherhood would be withdrawn from the Passion of Christ in the times of Persecution, whilst they thus learned to be ashamed of his Blood in the Oblations*: Whereas, if it belonged

longed not to them to drink of the Blood of the Oblation, jure communicationis, *by right of participation*, as St. *Cyprian* says it did, if they were not obliged to drink of it *in remembrance of him*, this consequence must be infirm.

4. Whereas they who did celebrate this Sacrifice with Bread and Water consecrated in the Morning Sacrifice, thought this a good excuse, that in the Evening Sacrifice they used Wine mixed with Water. St. *Cyprian* saith, That *this excuse is not sufficient*; partly, because *the People could not be all invited to the Evening Sacrifice*; partly, because *in every Sacrifice we make mention of Christ's Passion, and so must do no other thing in any Sacrifice than what Christ did*; which Reasons can carry no weight in them, but upon supposition of an obligation on the People to communicate of the consecrated Wine and Water. P. 136.

Lastly, He adds, That *if we blush to drink the Blood of Christ, we cannot be prepared to pour out our Blood for Christ*; which not the Priest alone, but all the People must be prepared to do; it therefore is extreamly evident, that here St. *Cyprian* discourseth not only of the Priest's obligation to *consecrate* Wine mixed with Water, but also of the Peoples obligation to *partake* of the *Cup* so consecrated. *Ibid.*

§. 3.

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* the *Apostles* are introduced, giving this order, (o) *When the Sacrifice is offered, let every order of Believers receive by themselves of the Lord's Body, and of his precious Blood.* The Title of which Constitution is, *What every one of the Clergy and Laity* ought to do *in the Assembly.* In the Sacramental Thanksgiving they speak thus, *We give thee thanks O Father for Christ's precious Blood shed for our sakes, and for his precious Body,* (p) *the* Antitypes *of which we now celebrate, he having commanded us to shew forth his Death.* This Prayer all the Faithful make, and all that are Baptized are the persons who are thus to shew forth his Death. In the Prayer after the divine Oblation, they say thus, (q) *Let the Bishop Communicate, then the Priests, Deacons,* &c. *Amongst the Women, the Deaconnesses, Virgins and Widows, then the Children, then all the People in their Order; and the Priest, let him tender the Oblation, saying, The Body of Christ, and let the Receiver say,* Amen; *the*

(o) Τὶ ἕκαστος ἐπιτελεῖν ὀφείλει τῶν συναθροισμένων κλήρικων ἢ λαικῶν ἐν τῇ συνάξει. l. 2. c. 57.

(p) Οὗ καὶ ἀντίτυπα ταῦτα ἐπιτελοῦμεν αὐτοῦ διαπαξαμένου ἡμῖν καταγγέλλειν τὸν αὐτοῦ θάνατον. l. 7. c. 25.

(q) *Lib.* 8. *cap.* 13.

the Deacon, let him hold the Cup, and giving it, ſay, The Blood of Chriſt, the Cup of Life, and he that drinketh it let him ſay, Amen.

(r) Ταῦτα περὶ τῆς μυστικῆς λατρείας διαταττόμεθα ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀπόστολοι ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις, &c. c. 15.

And in the cloſe of theſe Preſcriptions are theſe words, (r) *Theſe things we the Apoſtles have commanded you Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons to obſerve, touching the Myſtical Service.*

St. *Baſil* is an expreſs aſſertor of the ſame Doctrine; for he ſpends a whole Chapter to prove that he who is regenerated by *Baptiſm*, (s) ought *afterwards to be nouriſhed by the participation of the divine* Myſteries in the plural, not by one of them only, and (t) *how this ſhould be done*, Chriſt, ſaith he, *hath taught* us, *ſaying, unleſs you eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and* drink his Blood, *you have no Life in you. He that eateth my Fleſh, and* drinks *my Blood, hath eternal Life*, &c. And *at the cloſe of the Goſpels it is written, that Jeſus taking Bread, and giving thanks, brake, and gave it to his Diſciples, and ſaid, Take, eat, this is my Body broken for you, this do in remembrance of me; and taking the Cup, and giving thanks, he gave it to them, ſaying, Drink ye all of this*, &c. *The Apoſtle alſo doth atteſt theſe things, ſaying, I received from the Lord that which I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jeſus, in the Night in which he was betrayed, took Bread, and giving thanks, brake it, and ſaid, This is my Body broken for you, do this in remembrance of me: Likewiſe after Supper, he took the Cup, ſaying, This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood, do this in remembrance of me; for as oft as you ſhall eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, you ſhew forth the Lord's Death till he come.* (u) *What therefore do theſe words profit us? That eating and drinking we might be always mindful of him who died for us, and roſe again.* Which words are as full a confutation of the *Roman* Doctrine, as can be deſired by any *Proteſtant*.

(s) Ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως διὰ τοῦ Βαπτίσματος τελείας λοιπὸν τῇ μεταλήψει τῶν θείων μυστηρίων Tom. 1. l. 1. de Bapt. c 3.

(t) Καὶ πῶς τοῦτο γίνεσθαι ἐδίδαξεν ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν — Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν, λέγω ὑμῖν. p. 580.

(u) Τί οὖν ὠφελεῖ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα; ἵνα ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες ἀεὶ μνημονεύωμεν τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος. p. 581.

For they expreſly teach, that every Baptized perſon (x) is bound to partake of *both the Myſteries*, of the Bread and of the Cup, that our Lord hath taught him how he ſhould be nouriſhed by theſe myſteries, even by eating Sacramentally of his Fleſh, and drinking Sacramentally his Blood.

(x) Ὅτι ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Moral. Reg. 21. Tom. 2. p. 431.

That

That the words of the Institution of this Supper mentioned in the *Gospels*, and in particular those words, *Drink ye all of this*, belong to *all Believers*, even as much as the forementioned words, *He that eats my Flesh and drinks my Blood, hath eternal Life, &c.* they being here introduced to prove, that all Believers ought to be nourished by the holy Mysteries; that therefore,

3. *Do this*; in both these Places is not a Command directed to the *Apostles* to *Sacrifice* Christs Body and his Blood; but to Believers to eat and *drink* them. And,

4. That we are to remember and *shew forth Christs Death*, not only by eating, but by *drinking* also.

St. *Ambrose* speaking of these Sacraments, as he, and many of the *Ancients* call the consecrated Bread and Wine, informs us, that Christ speaks of them in the *Song of Songs*, saying, (*y*) *Eat my Brethren, and be inebriated; for as oft as thou* drinkest, *thou receivest Remission of Sins, and art inebriated with the Spirit.* And the same *Ambrose* elsewhere saith, *If as oft as this Blood is poured out, it is poured out for the Remission of Sins,* (*z*) *I* ought *alwaies to* receive *it, that my Sins may always be* remitted. In which Words he not only asserts, That Christ's *Blood* poured out, *ought* to be received; which cannot be done, by receiving it only by Concomitance with the Body, but also that our Lord *commands* his Brethren not to eat only of these *Mysteries*, but *to be inebriated*, and saith, That we are thus *inebriated by drinking*.

(*y*) Edite inquit fratres mei & inebrianimi. *De Sacram l.* 5. *c.* 3. quoties enim bibis, remissionem accipis peccatorum & inebriaris in Spiritu. *ibid.*

(*z*) Debeo illum semper accipere, ut semper mihi peccata dimittantur. *l.* 4. *c.* 6.

§. 4.

St. *Chrysostom* is copious on this Subject; for, saith he, *many things conduce to christian Love,* (*a*) *one Table is offered to all; the same Drink is given to all, and not only so, but it is given out of one Cup: For the* Father *being willing to induce us to love one another*, ordered this, *making us to drink out of one Cup, which is an Instance of intense Love:* So that the Sacrament of the *Cup*, according to St. *Chrysostom*, was of the Institution of the *Father*; and he thus ordered Matters for the Advancement of his great Commandment of *Christian Love*. In his Twenty seventh *Homily* upon the First Epistle to the *Corinthians*,

(*a*) Μία τράπεζα πρόκειται πᾶσιν, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποτὸν ἅπασι δέδοται. in Matt. Hom. 32. p 223.

ans, he saith, That *as Christ said over the Bread, and over the* Cup, *do this in Remembrance of me*; (*b*) *revealing to us the Cause of giving us this Mystery: So doth* St. Paul *here say, As often as you eat this Bread and* drink *this Cup, you shew the Lord's Death.* Christ therefore did command the drinking of this Cup, and did it for a Cause which will remain to the Worlds End, and equally concern all *Christians, viz.* The *Remembrance* and *Annunciation of his Death.* And in his Fifteenth *Homily* upon the First of *Timothy* he brings in Christ thus speaking to the Laity, as well as Clergy, *I have united, I have joined you to my self*; (*c*) *I have said* eat me, drink me: And whether *Christ*, or the *Trent Council* should be obeyed in this Matter, it is not hard to judge, especially if we consider, That in the Judgment of St. *Chrysostom*, Christ did not only institute, but command these things to be done. His Words are these: *As chiefly we remember those Words which we last hear from our departing Friends, and are wont to say, by way of Admonition to their Heirs, if they dare to transgress their Commands, consider this is the last Voice which your Father uttered, and till his last Breath he required these things.* Even *so* Paul *being willing hence to render his Discourse formidable: Remember*, saith he, *that he gave this his last Mystery, and in that very Night in which he was to be slain for us*, (*d*) *ταῦτα ἐνετέλλετο, he commanded these things.*

(*b*) Ὁ χριστὸς, τοῦτο ἔφη τὴν αἰτίαν ἐκκαλύπτων ἡμῖν τῆς μυστηρίου δόσεως. p. 421.

(*c*) Φάγε με εἶπον, πίε με. p. 816.

(*d*) In Cor. 1. Hom. 27. pag. 421.

St. *Austin* doth sufficiently inform us of the same thing by asking of this Question; *When our Lord saith, Except ye eat my Flesh and drink my Blood, you shall have no Life in you; how is it that the People are so much restrained from the Blood of the Sacrifices which were offered for Sins? If by those Sacrifices this one Sacrifice was signified*, (*e*) *from taking of the Blood of which Sacrifice, not only no Man is restrained, but* All Men are exhorted to drink it, *who will have Life, for surely such an* Exhortation *must be equivalent to a Command.*

(*e*) Ab hujus Sacrificii sanguine sumendo in alimentum, non solum nemo prohibetur, sed *ad bibendum omnes* exhortantur, qui volunt habere vitam. *qu.* 57. *in Levit.*

§. 5. *It is worth the Enquiry*, saith (*f*) *Procopius Gazæus, how it comes to pass, That when in the Law the eating of Blood is forbidden. Now Christ commandeth us to eat his Blood.*

(*f*) In Levit. p. 327.

Isidore

Isidore Hispalensis, §. 6.
saith, in Allusion to the Words of *Wisdom*, That *Christ, the Wisdom of God, hath built him an House, the Church, in which he hath slain the Sacrifices of his Body, in which he hath mingled the Wine of his Blood in the Cup of the divine Sacrament; and prepared his Table, that is, the Altar of the Lord, when sending forth his Servants the Apostles, and Teachers to the Foolish, that is, to all Nations that knew not the true God, he saith unto them,* (*g*) *Come, eat my Bread, and* drink *my Wine which I have mingled, that is, take ye the Meat of my sacred Body, and receive the Cup of my sacred Blood.* His Command therefore, according to *Isidore*, was by his *Apostles* sent to all Nations, and to the Foolish among them to *drink the Cup of his sacred Blood.*

(*g*) Dixit, eis venite, comedite panem meum & bibite vinum quod miscui vobis, id est Sancti corporis escam sumite, & poculum sanguinis sacri percipite. *De Gent. vet. cap.* 26.

The *Council* held at *Braga* in the same *Century*, speaking of those who delivered to the People a piece of Bread dipp'd in the Wine for the whole Communion, confutes this Practice, by recurring, not only to the Custom of the *Church*, but also to the Doctrine of the *Gospel*, and the *Command* of *Christ*; for, say they, (*h*) *how Repugnant this Practice is to the Doctrine of the Gospel, and Custom of the Church, may easily be proved from the Fountain of Truth, who gave the Cup by it self, saying*, Drink ye all *of this, as he took the Bread by it self, saying, Take, eat*, &c. Hence then we learn, That the Fountain of Truth *commanded*, and the Doctrine of the *Gospel* requireth, That all the People should receive the Cup; and that they should receive it ordinarily apart from the Bread.

(*h*) Quidam in Sacrificiis Domini — Eucharistam vino madidam pro complemento communionis credunt populis porrigendam — Quod quam sit Evangelicæ & Apostolicæ Doctrinæ contrarium non difficile ab ipso fonte veritatis probabitur a quo ordinata ipsa sacramentorum Mysteria processerunt. — Seorsim enim panis, seorsim & calicis commemoratio memoratur. *Concil. Tom.* 6. *p.* 563.

Regino quotes from *venerable Bede* these Words, (*i*) *When* §. 7.
the infirm Person hath been anointed, he presently is to be refreshed with the Body *and* Blood *of our Lord, that he may deserve to be quickned with Life Eternal in his Soul, when his corporal Life is*

(*i*) Postquam infirmus sacra Unctione fuerit delibutus, statim corpore & sanguine Domini recreandus est, ut de cujus vita temporali desperatur, vivificari in ejus vita æterna mereatur, ait enim Dominus, qui manducat, &c. Proinde sancti Canones præcipiunt ut nulli fideli in extremis posito Communio denegetur. *De Eccles. Disc. l.* 1. *c.* 129. *p.* 77.

despaired

despaired of; for our Lord saith, He that eats my Flesh, and drinks *my* Blood, *hath eternal Life; and unless you eat —— you shall have no Life in you: And hence the sacred Canons command that the Communion should be denyed to none of the Faithful in the Close of this Life.* Where we learn, 1. What was then understood by the Word Communion, *viz.* the receiving of both Species, the Body and the Blood, and how these Species were to be received, *viz.* The Flesh was to be eaten, and the Blood to be drunk. 2. Why they were to be both received, *viz.* Because of our Lords Sayings, *John* vi. And 3*ly.* We also learn, for Confutation of Mr. *Condom*'s first pretended Practice of the *Church*, That the Sick were to receive the Body and the Blood, and that the *Canons* of the *Church* required that they should not be withheld from them.

Zacharias Chrysopolitanus, cites from the same *Bede* these Words, (*k*) *Hence it is that he saith, Drink ye all of this, both with the Heart and with the Mouth, that ye may be Partakers of my Passion.*

(*k*) Hinc est quod ait, Bibite ex hoc omnes & ore & corde, ut sitis participes passionis meæ. *Monotess. p.* 306.

§. 8. *Paschasius Ratbertus* saith, *It is Christ alone who breaketh this Bread, and distributeth it to Believers by the Hands of his Ministers,* (*l*) *saying, Take ye, and* drink *ye all of this, as well Ministers as the rest of the Faithful: This is the Blood of the new and everlasting Testament. Cassander* informs us, That the *Gloss* called *expositio quadruplicis Missæ*, expounds the Words thus, (*m*) *Drink ye of this Cup of Blood,* All *without exception of Persons. Hincmarus Remensis*, having cited the same Words, adds (*n*) *Hæc dixit & dicit, This he said then, and this he saith now.* All plainly contradicting the *R. Gloss* (and Mr. *Condom*'s Exposition) That these Words, *Drink ye all of this, were only spoken to, and concern'd only the Apostles.*

(*l*) Similiter & calicem porrigit eis dicens, accipite & bibite ex hoc *omnes tam ministri quam reliqui credentes. cap.* 15.

(*m*) Ex hoc scilicet Calice sanguinis omnes scilicet sine personarum acceptione. *De Com. sub utraque specie, p.* 1043.

(*n*) Tom. 2. p. 90.

§ 9. *Lanfranck, Arch-bishop* of *Canterbury*, speaks thus to *Berengarius; If thou couldest with Christian Caution understand these things which ought to be understood literally, and spiritually,*

ſpiritually, (*o*) *thou wouldeſt without doubt believe that which the univerſal Church believes; thou wouldeſt publiſh what the Doctrine of the Apoſtles hath appointed to be publiſhed through the World,* viz. *That the* Body *and* Blood *of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is to be eaten and* drunken, *both by the Mouth and Body, and by the Mouth of the Heart; that is, both bodily and ſpiritually.* And *Anſelm* his Succeſſor in the ſame See, ſaith, *We ought to eat and drink this Sacrament two ways,* (*p*) *with the Mouth of the Heart, and of the Body.* The doing both theſe things, the drinking of the Blood of *Jeſus* with our Mouths, is that which ought to be done; that which the Doctrine of the *Apoſtles* hath appointed to be publiſhed.

(*o*) Proculdubio crederes quod univerſalis Eccleſia credit, prædicares quod Apoſtolica Doctrina in tota mundi latitudine prædicandum inſtituit; carnem ſcilicet & ſanguinem Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti & ore, & corpore, & ore cordis, hoc eſt, corporaliter, & ſpiritualiter manducari & bibi.— *De Sacr. Euch. f.* 131, 132.

(*p*) Ore cordis & ore Corporis. *Com. in* 1 *Cor.* 11.

Pope Paſchal writes to *Pontius, Abbot* of *Clun,* thus; (*q*) *Cyprian* writing to *Cæcilius* ſaith, *When any thing is required by the Inſpiration, and* command *of God, it is neceſſary that the faithful Servant ſhould obey his Lord.*——*Therefore in taking the Body and Blood of our Lord, according to the ſame* Cyprian, *let the Tradition of the Lord be obſerved, nor let that be departed from by any humane and novel Inſtitution which Chriſt our Maſter* commanded *and did.* He therefore owned the taking of the Cup apart from the Bread, to be a *Command* of *Chriſt,* which no *new Inſtitution* of Men could alter. *Our Lord Jeſus,* ſaith (*r*) *Hugo de Sancto Victore, inſtituted the Sacrament of the Body and the Blood of Chriſt, and commanded that they ſhould afterwards do the ſame thing in remembrance of himſelf.* (*s*) *Rupertus Tuitienſis* informs us, That *our Lord preſcribing the whole manner of eating his Fleſh, and drinking his Blood,* ſaith, * *Do this in remembrance of me.* §. 10.

(*q*) Scribens ad Cæcilium B. Cyprianus ait, quando aliquid Deo inſpirante, & mandante præcipitur, neceſſe eſt domino ſervus fidelis obtemperet, excuſatus apud omnes quod nihil ſibi arroganter aſſumat, ne aliud fiat a nobis quam quod pro nobis Dominus prior fecit, igitur in ſumendo corpore & ſanguine Domini, juxta eundem Cyprianum, *Dominica traditio ſervetur,* nec ab eo quod Chriſtus Magiſter & præcepit, & geſſit *humana, & novella inſtitutione,* diſcedatur; novimus enim per ſe panem, per ſe vinum ab ipſo Domino traditum, quem morem ſic ſemper in Sancta Eccleſia conſervandum docemus atque præcipimus, præterquam in parvulis, & omnino infirmis qui panem abſorbere non poſſunt. *Ep.* 32. *De non porrigenda Communione intincta. Concil. Tom.* 10. *p.* 656. (*r*) Lib. 2 de Sacram. Part. 8. Fol. 395. (*s*) In Johan. *Cap.* 6. * Vid Theoph. in Matth. *c.* 26. *p.* 162.

Arnoldus Carnotenſis delivers the ſame Doctrine moſt expreſly: For, ſaith he, (r) *the Doctrine of the Sacraments is new, and the evangelical Schools firſt brought forth this Command. This Diſcipline was firſt made known unto the World by Chriſt our Teacher, That Chriſtians ſhould drink Blood, the Uſe of which the old Law did forbid; for the old Law forbids the eating Blood, the Goſpel commands it ſhould be drunk: In which Commands the Chriſtian Religion ought chiefly to diſcern this, That the Blood of Beaſts, in all things differing from the Blood of Chriſt, hath only the Effect of temporal Vivification, and cannot profit to eternal Life; *but we* drink *of the Blood by his* Command, *being made Partakers of eternal Life with him, and by him. Chriſt himſelf is the Butler, who hath reach'd forth this Cup, and taught that we ſhould not only outwardly be daſhed with this Blood, but inwardly, by the powerful Aſperſion of it, ſhould be fortified in our Souls.*

(t) Scholæ Evangelicæ hoc primum magiſterium protulerunt.

Lex quippe eſum ſanguinis prohibet, Evangelium præcipit ut bibatur.

* Bibimus autem de ſanguine, Chriſto ipſo jubente. *Inter opera Cypr. adſcript. P.* 41.

Petrus Cluniacenſis, in the ſame Age ſpeaks thus, (u) *Chriſt commands, do this, not another thing; this which you have received to eat, which you take to* drink, viz. *My Body and Blood; this, ſay I, do in memory of me.——That which he did, he commanded them to do; That which he diſtributed to them, he would have them diſtribute to others. Chriſt,* ſaith St. *Bernard, the Day before his Paſſion, preſcribed to his Diſciples the Form of this Sacrament. He gave Efficacy to it,* i. e. (x) *He commanded it to be done. The Preſcription of the Form was under Bread and Wine; note the Order: Firſt he waſhes his Diſciples Feet, then, going back to the Table, He ordains the Sacrifice of his Body and Blood; giving the Bread apart, and the Wine apart, ſaying thus of the Bread, Take and eat, this is my Body; and of the Wine thus, Drink ye all of this.* And again, * *Concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, there is no Man who knoweth not, that upon that Day, That great and*

(u) Cum Chriſtus imperet N. B. dicens, Hoc facite, hoc plane, non aliud, hoc idem quod accipitis ad comedendum, quod ſumitis *ad bibendum*, corpus ſcilicet meum & ſanguinem, hoc inquam facite in meam commemorationem, quid ultra certe quæritis? —Quia quod fecit eos facere præcepit, quod eis diſtribuit hoc eos aliis diſtribuere voluit. *Ed. Eraſm. f.* 209.

(x) Hujus Sacramenti formam præſcripſit, efficaciam exhibuit, i. e. fieri præcepit. *De Cœna Dom. c. qui incipit,* Panem Angel. *f.* 320. b.

* De Sacramento quidem Corporis & ſanguinis ſui nemo eſt qui neſciat hanc quoque tantam & tam ſingularem alimoniam ea primum die exhibitam, ea die commendatam, & mandatam deinceps frequentari. *Serm.* 3. *in ramis Palm. fol.* 30. b.

ſingular

ſingular Nouriſhment was firſt exhibited, on that Day commended, and commanded *henceforth to be frequented.*

(y) *Albertus Magnus* teacheth, That *after Chriſt had exhibited his Body under the Species of Bread, he afterwards exhibited his Blood under the Species of Wine, and by the apoſtolical Statutes* commanded both *to be ſacramentally celebrated in the Church*; and having proved from the *Evangeliſts St. Matthew, Mark,* and *Luke*, That Chriſt celebrated both apart.—— *From all theſe things,* ſaith he, *'tis known or underſtood, that Chriſt, under one Species of Bread, delivered his Body, and under the other Species of Wine, his Blood, and ſo appointed it to be obſerved; and ſince Chriſt's Action is our Inſtruction,* Pro certo hæc duo nobis ſervanda eſſe præcepit, *He* commanded *theſe* Two *things moſt certainly to be obſerved, and therefore under* One Species *we* deliver *the Body, and under the other the* Blood. Where we ſee the Practice of the *Church* was then to deliver both Species, and that the Command of *Chriſt* was then conceived to be their Motive ſo to do, according to that ſaying of *Durantus*, (z) *In the primitive Church all that heard Maſs, uſed to communicate, becauſe the Apoſtles all drank of the Cup, the Lord ſaying,* Drink ye all *of this.* §. 11.

(y) Hoc dicimus, Quod poſtquam Chriſtus exhibuit corpus ſuum ſub ſpecie panis, tunc etiam poſtea exhibuit ſanguinem ſuum ſub ſpecie vini, & utrumque Sacramentaliter eſſe celebrandum præcepit in Eccleſia per ſtatuta Apoſtolica, & ideo Eccleſia inſtructa actione Chriſti, utrumque celebrat, diviſim conficiendo corpus ſub ſpecie panis, & diviſim conficiendo ſanguinem ſub ſpecie vini, quod autem duo hæc exhibuerit & celebranda inſtituerit Chriſtus patet, *Matth.* 27. — Ex omnibus iſtis accipitur quod Chriſtus ſub una ſpecie panis corpus ſuum tradidit, ſub altera ſpecie vini tradidit ſanguinem, & *ſic ſervandum inſtituit*, & cum Chriſti actio ſit noſtra inſtructio, pro certo hæc duo nobis ſervanda eſſe præcepit, & ideo ſub una ſpecie corpus, & ſub alia *tradimus* ſanguinem, *Sum. de Sacr. Euch. Diſt.* 3. *tr.* 2. *c.* 5.

(z) In primitiva Eccleſia omnes qui celebrationi Miſſarum intererant ſingulis diebus communicare ſolebant, eo quod Apoſtoli omnes de calice bibebant, Domino dicente, Bibite ex hoc omnes, *Rat. l.* 4. *c.* 53.

Here then, beſides what hath already been obſerved from theſe Paſſages, we farther learn; §. 12.

1. That every Order of Believers ought to receive of the Lords Body, and of his precious Blood *apart*; That they ought *to* drink this Cup *with the Mouth of the Body.*

2. That the *Tradition* of our *Lord* is to be obſerved, and not departed from, by reaſon of any *humane and novel Inſtitution.*

3. That the *Apoſtles* commanded theſe things to be obſerved, that the Doctrine of the *Goſpel*, and the Cuſtom of the *Church* require the Cup ſhould be received apart, that this the *univerſal Church believes*, and the Doctrine of the *Apoſtles* hath appointed this to be publiſhed throughout the world, that the Blood of our *Lord Jeſus* is to be drunk by the mouth of the Body, that the *Goſpel* commands it ſhould be drunk, that the *Apoſtolical Statutes* commanded both to be celebrated in the Church, that God himſelf ordered that we ſhould all drink out of one Cup, and that this is required by the inſpiration and command of God; that Chriſt ſaid, *Eat me, Drink me*, that he *exhorted all Men to drink* of his Blood; that he ſent forth his *Apoſtles* and Teachers, to invite them to drink of the Wine that he had mingled, and to receive the Cup of his ſacred Blood; that he *commanded* theſe things, that he ſo appointed it to be obſerved, and that we drink of the blood of Chriſt *by his command*.

Interim autem dum ab eo in hoc mundo peregrinamur, *Corpore & ſanguine ejus* in via paſcimur, ſicut Apoſtolis ſuis hoc Myſterium in cœna ultima ante mortem ſuam tradidit, & nobis ſequentibus frequentandum *per eos mandavit*. *Guitm. de. Sacram. lib.* 3. *fol.* 91. b.

4. That the command, *Drink ye all of this*, was by *Chriſt* directed *as well unto the People as the Miniſters, to all without exception*, that what Chriſt did he commanded his followers to do, *what he diſtributed to them, he would have them diſtribute to others*, and that in the *Primitive Church all communicated*, becauſe Chriſt ſaid to his Apoſtles, *Drink ye all of this*.

5. That by receiving of both kinds, they ſhewed forth Chriſt's Death, and this is as much as any *Proteſtant* hath ſaid, or needs to ſay.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

The Contents.

Whereas these Councils take upon them to Decree this Sacrament shall be celebrated otherwise, than by their own confession it was instituted by Christ, The Fathers in the general assert, That this Mystery ought not to be celebrated otherwise than it was delivered by Christ and his Apostles, §. 1. *When some delivered the Bread dipp'd in the consecrated Cup as a compleat Communion, they condemned this practice as varying from the Institution and from the practice of the Church,* §. 2. *They condemned the offering on the Altar, other things besides Bread, Wine and Water for the same Reasons,* §. 3. *They condemned the using Wine not mixed with Water on the same account,* §. 4. *They condemned the celebration of this Mystery in consecrated Bread and Water only from the same grounds,* §. 5. *Inferences against Communion in one kind from the premises,* §. 6.

SEcondly, whereas the Councils of *Constance* and of *Trent* confess, That Christ instituted this venerable Sacrament *under both species*, and so delivered it to his Apostles, and that the *Primitive Church* did practise suitably unto this Institution, and yet deny that there lies any Obligation on *Christians* from this Institution, or this practice to administer it, or to receive it in both kinds, asserting they have power as *dispensatores Mysteriorum Dei*, *Dispensers of the Mysteries of God*, to make this change in the Administration of this Sacrament, whereas, I say, these are the bold Assertions of the forementioned *Councils*; in opposition to them the Sayings of the *Fathers* are very clear and pregnant, in which they plainly shew they thought themselves, and all that bare the Name of *Christians*, obliged to observe the Institution of the Sacrament, which by the Confessions of the *Councils* of *Trent* and *Constance*, was in both kinds, and in the distribution of it, to do as *Christ* the Author of it did, *viz.* to give both species apart to the Communicants, which came to be partakers of this Holy Sacrament. And,

Sess. 13. Sess. 21. c. 3.

Sess. 21. cap. 2.

1. The

§. 1. 1. The Author which passeth under the Name of *Ambrose*, in his Comment on these words, *He that eateth this Bread, or drinks this Cup unworthily*, &c. saith thus, (*a*) *He pronounces him unworthy of the Lord, who otherwise doth celebrate this Mystery than it was delivered by him; for he cannot be devout who presumes to do it otherwise, than it was given by the Author.* And this good Rule in after-Ages was approved of, and even transcribed by the *Ritualists*, and by the *Commentators* on the same place, (*b*) *He eats unworthily*, saith Haymo, *that is, not observing order, who either celebrates*, or takes *that Mystery otherwise than it was delivered by the Holy Fathers.* St. *Anselm* in his Comment on the same Chapter saith, That "St. *Paul* reproved the *Corinthians* because they did not well observe what "he had delivered, touching this matter, he having delivered "to them what the Lord delivered to him, and therefore "that which they ought to retain reverently and inviolably; adding, That (*c*) *he eats and drinks unworthily, who either celebrates or* receives *that Mystery otherwise than it was delivered by our Lord.* The *Gloss* cites the same words from *Ambrose*, *Aquinas* from the *Gloss*. *He is unworthy*, saith Hugo, *who celebrates the Mystery otherwise than by Christ it was delivered.* And he, saith *Lyra*, is unworthy, (*d*) *who observes not the Custom instituted by Christ.* *Gregory* the Third condemns the placing Two or Three Cups upon the Altar at once, as being not agreeable to the practice of our Lord. For, saith he (*e*) *In the Solemnities of the Mass that is to be observed which our Lord Jesus gave to his Disciples, for he took the Cup, and gave it to them saying, This is the Cup of the New Testament in my Blood, this do as often as you take it.* And (*f*) *Rabanus Maurus* saith, *It is not lawful to offer any other thing in the Sacraments, than that which our Lord himself appointed, and by his Example taught us to do.*

(*a*) Indignum dicit esse domino qui aliter mysterium celebrat quam ab eo traditum est, non enim potest devotus esse qui aliter præsumit quam datum est ab Authore. *In locum.*

(*b*) Indigne dicit, i. e, ordine non observato, viz. qui aliter Mysterium illud celebrat vel sumit quam traditum est a sanctis patribus. *Haym. in locum, p.* 130.

(*c*) Qui aliter mysterium celebrat quam a Christo traditum est. *Ibid.*

(*d*) Qui non observat ritum a Christo institutum. *Ibid.*

(*e*) In missarum solemniis observandum est quod dominus noster Jesus Christus Sanctis suis distribuit discipulis, accepit enim calicem & dedit eis, dicens, Hic est calix Novi Testamenti in meo sanguine, hoc facite quotiescunque sumitis. *Ep. ad Bonifacium.*

(*f*) De Instit. Cler. *l.* 1. *c.* 31.

§. 2. 2*dly*. Some in the *Church* did frequently attempt the alteration of *Christ*'s Institution by giving to the People the Bread dipp'd

dipp'd in the ſacred Blood for a compleat Communion, but againſt theſe Innovators in the Fourth Century, *Pope Julius* oppoſed himſelf, laying down this for his Rule, That it was by no means lawful for any to *recede* from our *Lord*'s Inſtitution, Practice and Example. His Words are theſe, (*g*) *We have heard that ſome perſons, being guilty of Schiſmatical Ambition, do, againſt the divine Orders, and Apoſtolical Inſtitution, deliver to the People the Euchariſt dipp'd in the Blood for an intire Communion. How contrary theſe things are to the Evangelical and Apoſtolical Doctrine, and oppoſite to the Eccleſiaſtical Cuſtom, it is not hard to prove from the Fountain of Truth, from whom the Inſtitution of theſe Sacramental Myſteries proceeded, for they have no Teſtimony from the Goſpel for this, where Chriſt commended his Body and Blood to his Diſciples, for there is recorded the commendation of his Body and Blood apart.* The Council of (*h*) *Braga* in the Seventh Century in the very ſame words condemns this Practice, blaming them, who, for the whole Communion delivered to the People a piece of Bread dipp'd in the Conſecrated Wine, *Which Cuſtom how contrary*, ſay they, *it is to the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and the Practice of the Church, we may learn from the Fountain of Truth, who gave the Cup by it ſelf, ſaying, Drink ye all of this; as he took the Bread by it ſelf, ſaying, Take, eat, &c.* (*i*) *Micrologus* ſaith, *It is not Authentick that ſome dip the Body of Chriſt, and diſtribute it ſo dipp'd for a full Communion, for the* Roman *Order contradicts it, for in the day of Preparation it commands, that the Wine not conſecrated, ſhould be conſecrated by the Lord's Prayer, and the mixture of the Lord's Body with the Blood, that* the People may fully Communicate, *which would be a ſuperfluous Command, if the Lord's Body dipp'd in the Cup the day before, and preſerved, would ſuffice to Communicate the People with: And therefore Pope* Julius * *writing to the Biſhops of* Ægypt, *doth wholly forbid this Intinction, and teacheth, that the Bread and the Cup ſhould be both taken apart*, according to our Lord's Inſtitution. *Humbertus* in his Diſputation againſt the *Greeks*, ſaith thus, *That*

(*g*) Audivimus enim quoſdam Schiſmatica ambitione detentos, contra divinos ordines & Apoſtolicas inſtitutiones, — intinctam Euchariſtiam populis pro complemento Communionis porrigere. — Quod quam ſit Evangelicæ & Apoſtolicæ doctrinæ contrarium, & conſuetudini Eccleſiaſticæ adverſum, non difficile ab ipſo fonte veritatis probatur, a quo ordinata ipſa Sacramentorum myſteria proceſſerunt. — Ubi Apoſtolis corpus ſuum commendavit & ſanguinem, ſeorſum enim panis, & ſeorſum calicis commendatio memoratur. *Concil. Tom. 2. p. 525, 526.*

(*h*) Eadem habet Concil. Bracarenſe. *Tom. 6. p. 562, 563.*

(*i*) Ut populus plene poſſit communicare. *cap. 19.*

* Julius quoque Papa ſeorſim panem & ſeorſim calicem, juxta dominicam Inſtitutionem ſumenda docet. *Idem ibid.*

you

you are wont to take the Holy Bread of Life eternal in a Spoon dipped in the Cup, what can you offer for it? (k) *for our Lord did not thus dip Bread in the Cup of Wine, and so give it to his Apostles, saying, Take and eat this in a Spoon, This is my Body; but as the* Roman Church even to this day observes, *he blessed the whole Bread, and distributed it, being broken, to every one apart, saying, Take and eat, This is my Body, to whom he also after Supper reached forth the Cup, saying,* Drink ye all of this, *which* Institution *to be* revered by Men and Angels, *Holy* Zion, *the first Church, even to this Day, as it received from the Apostles, so doth it faithfully retain it.* And then having cited a long passage from the *Church* of *Jerusalem*, he adds, *Hence is it clearer than the light, that the holy Church of* Jerusalem *did of old observe the same Rite of the divine Sacrifice which the holy* Roman *Church ceaseth not hitherto to observe; for we lay upon the Holy Altars thin Cakes of Flour prepared, whole and sound, and Communicate with the People of them, being after consecration broken, and then we are made to drink of the Cup of Wine, and liquid Blood, for we find Bread sopp'd was delivered by Christ to none but the Traytor* Judas, *to signifie that he was to betray him.* Again, he having said, That *Christ* delivered the Bread and Wine apart, and that the *Church* of *Christ* religiously observed his Institution, adds, That (l) *it could not be that any one should prevail to commend this Holy Mystery of Faith more conveniently, or truly, than he who delivered himself an Oblation, and a Sacrifice of a Sweet Odor to God for us, the immaculate Lamb of God, who taketh away the Sins of the World, to whom the most perfect knowledge of any Man being compared, is the highest Ignorance.* In the Year of our Lord 1118. *Pope Paschal* the Second, writes an Epistle to *Pontius*, *Abbot* of *Clun*, after this wise: (m) *Blessed* Cyprian *writing to* Cæcilian *saith, That when any thing is required by God's* Inspiration and Command, *it is necessary that the faithful Servant should obey his Lord, and he will be excused of all Men, that he assumeth nothing arrogantly to himself, nor may any other thing be done by us, than what our Lord first*

(k) Neque enim ipse Dominus panem in Calice vini intrivit, & sic Apostolis dedit, sed sicut Sancta Romana Ecclesia usque nunc observat, panem integrum benedixit, & fractum singulis particulatim distribuit, dicens, Accipite & comedite, hoc est corpus meum; quibus, postquam cœnatus est, calicem porrexit, dicens, Bibite ex eo omnes. Quam *Reverendam Angelis* & hominibus institutionem prima scilicet Ecclesia usque ad hæc moderna tempora, sicut ab Apostolis recepit, fideliter retinuit. — *Apud Baron. Tom.* 11. *p.* 971.

(l) Nec potest fieri ut quilibet convenientius aut verius commendare prævaluisset Sacrosanctum Mysterium fidei, quam ipse qui tradidit seipsum pro nobis oblationem. — *Ibid. p.* 974.

(m) Ep. 32. de non porrigenda Communione intincta. *Concil. Tom.* 10. *p.* 656.

firſt did for us. Therefore in taking the Body and the Blood of Chriſt, according to the ſame St. Cyprian, *Let the Tradition of our Lord be kept, nor let us recede by* any humane and novel Inſtitution *from that which our Lord both commanded and did; for we know that the Bread was delivered by our Lord apart, and the Wine apart, which Cuſtom we* teach, *and* require to be obſerved perpetually *in the* Church, *excepting only in the Caſe of Infants and Infirm Perſons, who cannot receive the Bread. Hildebert, Biſhop* of *Mans,* doth vehemently reprove the Cuſtom of giving the Bread ſopped, uſed in this or ſome other *Monaſtery*; for, writing to the *Abbot* of ſome Monaſtery, he ſaith, *It is judicial obſtinacy to preferr Cuſtom before Truth*: And having proved this from the words of St. *Cyprian* and St. *Auſtin*, he proceeds thus; *This, Brother, I have therefore ſpoken, that being rouzed up, thou maiſt awake, and ſee that* (n) *neither the Goſpels nor Decrees agree with that diſtribution of the Sacrament of the Altar, which is practiſed in your Monaſtery; for there the Cuſtom is to give the Sacrament to none, but in Bread ſteeped in the Wine, which is neither found to be taken from our Lord's Inſtitution, nor from Authentick Sanctions: If you conſult St.* Matthew, Mark *and* Luke, *you will find the Bread to have been delivered apart, and the Wine apart, for we read not that Chriſt gave Bread ſopped to any but that Diſciple, whom he thereby ſhewed to be the betrayer of his Maſter.* (o) *The Euchariſt*, ſaith *Lombard*, *ought not to be given to any Body ſopped for a Supplement of the Communion, for we read of no ſopped Bread given to any one, but* Judas. Laſtly, a Council held at *London, A. D.* 1175. (p) *forbids any perſon to deliver the Euchariſtical Bread dipped in Wine for a compleat Communion, for,* ſay they, *we read not that our Lord gave the Bread ſopped to any, but to that Diſciple whom he thereby declared to be the Diſciple that was to betray him.*

(n) Traditioni Sacramentorum Altaris quæ in veſtro celebris eſt Monaſterio nec Evangelia conſonant nec decreta concordant: In eo enim conſuetudinis eſt Euchariſtiam nulli niſi intinctam dari, quod nec ex Dominica Inſtitutione, nec ex Sanctionibus Authenticis reperiatur aſſumptum. — *Epiſt.* 64.

(o) Euchariſtia intincta non debet dari populo *pro ſupplemento Communionis. Sent. l.* 4. *Diſt.* 11. *lit.* f.

(p) Inhibemus ne quis quaſi pro complemento Communionis intinctam alicui tradat Euchariſtiam, nam intinctum panem aliis Chriſtum præbuiſſe non legimus, excepto illo tantum Diſcipulo quem intincta buccella Magiſtri proditorem oſtenderit. *Apud Binium, Tom.* 7. *Part* 2. *p.* 642.

Now hence, ſaith (q) *Caſſander*, it appears, That *they who received the Cuſtom of dipping the Bread into the conſecrated Cup,*

(q) De utraq; ſpecie, *p.* 1027.

did believe that both kinds were by all means to be used for an entire and full Communion: For, wherefore did they dip the Bread in the Mystical Cup of our *Lord's* Blood, if one species by it self would have sufficed for a full and lawful Communion? And seeing they who administred the Bread dipp'd in the consecrated Cup, did this because they conceived it necessary that both kinds should be received at least together; and they who reprehended this Custom, did therefore reprehend it, because they held that both kinds were to be received apart, according to our *Lord's* Institution, and the constant Custom of the *Church*: It is evident, that all did then agree, that both kinds were to be received, and that it was not lawful to receive under the species of Bread alone.

§. 3. 3*ly*. Others attempted to vary from the Institution of our Lord, and from the practice of the *Apostles*, and the succeeding Ages of the *Church*, by offering on the Altar or Communion-Table not only Bread and Wine, but also *Milk* and *Honey*, &c. which thing the *Ancient Fathers* and *Councils* do with one voice condemn, as being contrary to the Institution of our *Lord*. The Title of the Third *Canon* of the *Apostles* runs thus *That nothing is to be offered in the Sacrifice, besides that which our Lord appointed*; and in the body of the *Canon*, the offering Milk or Honey is condemned, as being παρὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου διάταξιν ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ, *besides the Constitution of our Lord touching the Sacrifice*, and the *Bishop* or *Presbyter* who doth this is to be deposed, ὡς παρὰ τὴν διάταξιν Κυρίου ποιῶν, *as doing besides the Constitution of the Lord*. *Our Lord*, saith *Zonaras* upon this *Canon*, *delivering to his Apostles the celebration of this unbloody Sacrifice to be performed in Bread and Wine*, διὸ καὶ Ἀπόστολοι ἕτερόν τι πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν προσάγεσθαι ἀπηγόρευσαν. *For this cause the Apostles forbad any other thing to be brought to the Sacrifice*. The *Church* of (r) *Africa* made a *Canon* to the same effect, *viz.* That *it is not lawful to offer any thing in the Sacraments, besides Bread and Wine, mixed with Water*, and the reason there assigned is, That nothing else is to be offered, *quàm quod ipse Dominus tradidit, than that which our Lord himself delivered*. This *Canon* is cited and confirmed in the Fifth *General Council* held in (s) *Trullo*, for the same Reason, That, *in this Sacrament things ought to be performed*, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος παρέδωκεν, *according as our Lord himself*

(r) Can. 37.

(s) Can. 32.

ſelf delivered. *Pope Julius* in the Fourth, and the *Council* of *Braga* in the Seventh *Century*, ſay not as the *Canons* of the *Eaſtern Church*, that ſome offered *Milk beſides Bread and Wine*, but that they offered, *lac pro vino*, *Milk for Wine*; this practice they condemn in theſe words; (*t*) *When the Maſter of Truth would commend to his Diſciples the true Sacrifice of our Salvation, he gave to none Milk, but only Bread and Wine in the Sacrament; let therefore Milk ceaſe to be offered, becauſe the manifeſt and evident example of Evangelical Truth hath ſhined forth, that, beſides Bread and Wine, nothing elſe may be offered.* And again, *Henceforth it ſhall be lawful to none to offer any thing elſe in the divine Sacrifices, but according to the Sentence of the Ancient Councils, Bread and Wine only mixed with Water.* (*u*) *Strabo* informs us, That *though the uſe of the Sacraments was delivered by Chriſt, and from the Apoſtles and Apoſtolical Men, was diffuſed throughout the whole Catholick Church, yet we underſtand from the Apoſtolical Canons, that, in the firſt Ages, ſome were wont to offer other Oblations, who therefore by the third of their Canons are to be depoſed, as doing* contra Conſtitutionem Domini, *againſt the Conſtitution of our Lord.* And theſe *Decrees* we find in (*x*) *Ivo*, and in (*y*) *Gratian*, and do thence learn, that they continued to be *Authentick* in their Days.

(*t*) Cum enim Magiſter veritatis verum ſalutis noſtræ Sacrificium ſuis commendaret diſcipulis, nulli lac, ſed panem tantum & Calicem ſub hoc Sacramento cognoſcimus dediſſe, legitur enim in Evangelica veritate, accepit Jeſus panem & Calicem, &c. ceſſet ergo lac ſacrificando offerri, quia manifeſtum & evidens exemplum veritatis Evangelicæ illuxit, quod præter panem & vinum, aliud offerri non liceat, *Concil. To.* 2. *p.* 525, 526. *Concil. Brac. To.* 6. *p.* 564.

(*u*) Lib. de rebus Eccleſ. *cap.* 18.

(*x*) Decret. part 2. c. 18.

(*y*) Decret. part 3. de conſecr. diſt. 2. c. 4, 5.

Now here let it be noted, that all theſe *Fathers*, and *Councils* who condemn *intinction*, and the oblation of other things upon the *Altar* beſides Bread, Wine and Water, give this as a ſufficient reaſon for ſo doing, That *theſe things were not agreeable unto that inſtitution which was to be* revered by Men and Angels, from which it was *by no means lawfull to depart*, and *to which Chriſtians were obliged to adhere*; and ſurely they who ſo Religiouſly condemned, and ſtrenuouſly oppoſed themſelves againſt the Cuſtom of *intinction*, and of *offering Milk and Honey*, becauſe of the Repugnancy which theſe things bore unto the manner of, and the Rule obſerved in our *Lord*'s Inſtitution of this Sacrament, would have been filled with holy indignation, had they known of any who wholly did with-hold from, or deny the Cup unto the People. Sure they who taught that to

do these things against the *Divine Orders* and *Apostolical Constitution*, was to be guilty of *a manifest Error*, and of *Schismatical Ambition*, could not have passed a milder Censure on the substraction of the Cup from all the *Laity*. They who declared, that to do these things was to act *contrary to the Evangelical Doctrine*, and *Ecclesiastical Custom* or the *Practice* of the *Church*, would have declared with a greater zeal against the defalcation of that Cup, of which our *Lord* said in the Institution, *Drink ye all of this*, of which *all the Apostles drank*, and which was, in complyance with this Institution and this Example, confessedly received by all *Christians* in the first Ages of the *Church*. They who would not allow *intinction* to be sufficient for a *compleat and full Communion of the People*, or for a *Supplement of the Communion*, would much less have allowed that the Communion was intire and full, when nothing but the Bread was given to them. They who declared that *nothing could be offered to justifie* this variation from our Lord's Institution, could much less think that any thing would justifie this greater variation from it. They who affirm *it could not be that any one should commend this Mystery of Faith more conveniently, or truly, than that Jesus, to whom the most perfect knowledge of any Man being compared, is the highest ignorance*, and that *the Tradition of our Lord is to be kept, and not receded from on the account of any humane, or novel Institution*, could not imagine the Councils either of *Trent* or *Constance* could have any power given by the Author of that Institution, to make a Law for the omitting one part of it, with a (z) *non obstante* to our Lord's Institution, and to the practice of the *Church*. They, lastly, who assert, *It is judicial obstinacy to preferr Custom before Truth*, must have abhorred that plea for half Communion used by the Council of *Constance*, that it was a *Custom reasonably introduced by the Church*, and by the *Holy Fathers, and had been long observed, and therefore was to be retained as a Law*.

(z) Concil. Const. Sess. 13.

Again, They who condemn the offering *Milk* and *Honey* on the Altar, as being *besides the Institution of our Lord*, and for this reason do forbid and punish it, would more assuredly have condemned and punished that defalcation of the Cup, which is confessedly contrary to the Institution. They who took care that in this matter things should be done, ὡς ὁ Κύριος παρέδωκεν, *as the Lord delivered them*, would never have allowed that this

this Sacrament ſhould be adminiſtred otherwiſe than he had Inſtituted it to be received. And laſtly, they who argued, *That nothing elſe was to be offered, becauſe nothing elſe was mentioned in the Goſpel*, would never have endured that what was mentioned in the Goſpel, as offered and diſtributed to all, ſhould not only be omitted, but forbidden, under the ſevereſt Penalties.

§. 4.

4*ly*. Some varied from the practice of the *Church* from the beginning, uſed with reſpect to the Cup, and that Two Ways.

1. By uſing in this Sacrament Wine not mixed with Water; this neglect the *Ancient Fathers* and *Councils* do with one voice condemn, as varying from the Inſtitution of our *Lord*, and from the practice of the *Church*, and ſolemnly decree that in conformity to both, the Wine they offered and diſtributed, ſhould be continually mixed with Water. The Conſtitutions of St. *Clemens* ſay, That (*a*) *our Lord mixed the Cup with Wine and Water, and ſanctifying it, he gave it to them, ſaying, Drink ye all of it, and that therefore* κατὰ τ' αὐτοῦ διάταξιν, *according to his Order or Inſtitution, they offered to him this Bread and this Cup.* And this they did, ſaith *Cotelerius*, againſt Two Hereſies, that of the *Monophyſites* and the *Armenians*, who uſed only Wine in the *Myſteries*. The (*b*) *African* Council ſaith, *that nothing is to be offered in the Sacraments but Bread*, & merum aqua mixtum, *and Wine mixed with Water, as our Lord delivered.* *Pope Julius* ſaith, That (*c*) *the Cup of our Lord, according to the commands of the Canons, ought to be offered with Wine mixed with Water*, and that *the Cup of the Lord cannot be Wine or Water alone, but that both muſt be mixed.* The Councils of (*d*) *Worms* and (*e*) *Braga*, condemn the neglect of mixing Water, in the very words of *Pope Julius*. The General Council held in *Trullo* ſaith the ſame thing, condemning the *Armenians* who celebrated the Euchariſt with Wine not mixed with Water, as acting againſt the Tradition of the *Apoſtles*, and Decreeing, That the *Biſhop* or the *Prieſt* who did thus celebrate the Myſteries ſhould be depoſed, (*f*) *as imperfectly ſhewing forth the Myſtery, and innovating in things delivered.*

(*a*) L. 8. c. 12. p. 351.

(*b*) Can. 37.

(*c*) Calix dominicus juxta Canonum præcepta vino & aqua permixtus debet offerri— non enim poteſt Calix domini eſſe aqua ſola, aut vinum ſolum, niſi utrumque miſceatur. *Apud Ivon. Decret. part.* 2. *c.* xi.

(*d*) Concil. Wormatenſe apud eundem, *Cap.* 12. & *Concil. To.* 2. *p.* 526.

(*e*) Calix dominicus juxta quod quidam Doctor edifferit, vino & aqua permixtus debet offerri. *Concil. Brac.* 4. *Concil. To.* 6. *p.* 563.

(*f*) Ὡς ἀτελῶς τὸ μυστήριον καταγγέλλων, καὶ ὡς καινίζων τὰ παραδοθέντα. Can. 32. *Iſidore*

Isidore saith, That Wine alone cannot be offered in the Sacrifice of the Cup, and that (*g*) *the spiritual Sacrifice is then perfected when they are both mixed.* This mixture some of them held necessary, because our *Saviour*'s side being pierced with a Launce, not only Blood, but Water also issued thence, *for which cause,* saith (*h*) *Zonarus,* ἀναγκάιως ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ νενόμισται, ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς μυστηρίοις ὕδωρ τῷ οἴνῳ ἐγκιρνᾶν, *it was necessarily determined by the Church, that in the holy Mysteries Wine should be mixed with Water.* That Wine and Water ought thus to be mixed, saith (*h*) *Pope Alexander, We have received from the Fathers, and even reason teacheth, because both flowed from our Saviour's Side in his Passion.* (*k*) [1] *Alcuin,* [2] *Rabanus Maurus,* and [3] *Micrologus,* assign the same reason; others following St. *Cyprian* give this mystical Reason of this mixture, That *in* (*l*) *Scripture Water signifies the People, the Wine shews the Blood of Christ, and therefore, if Wine alone be offered, the Blood of Christ will be without the People, if only Water, the People will be without Christ:* So *Pope Julius,* the Councils of (*m*) *Braga* and *Worms*; but, others say, this must be done *in complyance with our Lord's Institution,* and the *Practice* of the *Church,* that we may do the same thing which our Lord did (*n*) *& a Magisterio divino non recedamus, and may not recede from his Command.*

(*g*) Quando autem miscetur utrumque, tunc spirituale Sacrificium perficitur. *Lib.* 1. *c.* 18.

(*h*) In Can. 32. Concil. Trull.

(*i*) — Quia utrumq; ex latere ejus in sua passione profluxisse legitur. *Apud Ivon. decret. Part.* 2. *c.* 15.

(*k*) [1] Cap. de celebr. Miss. *p.* 88. *c.* 10. [2] *L.* 1. *c.* 19. [3] *C.* 10.

(*l*) Videmus populum in aqua intelligi, in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi, ergo — si vinum tantum quis offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis, si vero aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo. *Julius Concil. Tom.* 2. *p.* 526.

(*m*) Concil. Brac. Concil. Tom. 6. p. 563.

(*n*) Amalar. de Eccles. Offic. l. 3. c. 24.

§. 5. 2. Others used Water without Wine in Celebration of those Mysteries, and that not out of aversation to Wine (which was the cause why the *Aquarii,* the *Encratites* and the *Manichæans* did refuse to drink it in the Sacrament,) for in the Evening-Sacrifice they freely drank it, but to avoid being discovered to be *Christians* by smelling of it in the Morning. Now against these persons St. *Cyprian* argues from the institution of the Sacrament by *Christ,* and from his practice in the Oblation and the *distribution* of it. (*o*) *For know,* saith he, *that we*

(*o*) Admonitos autem nos scias, ut in calice offerenda dominica traditio servetur, neque aliud fiat a nobis, quam quod pro nobis dominus prior fecerit. *Cyp. Ep.* 63. *p.* 48.

art

are admoniſhed to obſerve the Tradition of the Lord, in offering the Cup, and that nothing elſe may be done by us, than that which our Lord did firſt for us. Now *Cyprian* before had ſaid, That *in offering the Cup, and* miniſtering it to the People, *our Lord had uſed Water mixed with Wine.* Again he adds, *if Jeſus Chriſt be the High-Prieſt of God the Father, and firſt offered himſelf a Sacrifice to the Father, and commanded this to be done in commemoration of himſelf*; (*p*) *ſurely that Prieſt truly officiates in Chriſt's ſtead, who imitates that which Chriſt did, and offers a full and true Sacrifice to God the Father, if ſo he doth begin to offer as he ſaw Chriſt did offer.* —— And again, (*q*) *To declare the Statutes, and take the Teſtaments of the Lord into our Mouths, and not to do the ſame thing which our Lord did, what other thing is it than to reject his Words, and to contemn the Lord's Diſcipline?* And whereas ſome pleaded a Cuſtom for offering only Water, he ſaith, (*r*) *We muſt enquire whom the Authors of this Cuſtom followed, for if in the Sacrifice which Chriſt offered, Chriſt alone is to be followed, ſurely that we ought to obey, and do which Chriſt did and commanded to be done; for we muſt not follow the* Cuſtom of Man, *but the Truth of God.* Laſtly, *Becauſe we make mention of his Paſſion in all our Sacrifices, we ought to do nothing but what he did, for the Scripture ſaith, As often as you eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, you ſhew the Lord's Death till he come*; (*s*) *wherefore as oft as we offer up the Cup in commemoration of our Lord, and of his Paſſion, we ought to do that which it is manifeſt he did.* Now here let it be noted.

(*p*) Utique ille Sacerdos vice Chriſti vere fungitur, qui id quod Chriſtus fecit imitatur. — *p.* 155.

(*q*) Exponere enim juſtificationes & Teſtamentum Domini, & non hoc idem facere quod fecerit Dominus, quid aliud eſt quam ſermones ejus abjicere, & diſciplinam Dominicam contemnere. *p.* 157.

(*r*) — Si in Sacrificio quod Chriſtus obtulerit, non niſi Chriſtus ſequendus eſt, utique id nos obaudire, & facere oportet quod Chriſtus fecit, & quod faciendum eſſe mandavit! — Neque enim hominis conſuetudinem ſequi oportet, ſed Dei veritatem. *p.* 154, 155.

(*s*) — Quotieſcunque ergo calicem in commemorationem paſſionis ejus offerimus, id quod conſtat Dominum feciſſe faciamus. *p.* 156.

That from the Third to the Twelfth *Century*, this Diſcourſe of *Cyprian* is cited, and approved by all the *Doctors* of the *Weſtern Church*, by *Pope Julius*, by the Councils of *Braga* and *Worms*, by *Iſidore*, by *Alcuin*, *Rabanus Maurus*, *Walafridus Strabo*, by *Micrologus*, *Amalarius*, by *Ivo* and *Gratian*; and particularly that *Amalarius* having cited theſe Words, ("We find that it is not obſerved by us which is commanded, "unleſs we do the ſame things which Chriſt did, and mixing "the Cup after the ſame manner recede not from the divine "Inſtitution.") Ubi ſupra.

(t) Quamvis hoc ille de commixtione vini & aquæ concluſiſſet, tamen de tota Inſtitutione Dominica intelligere poſſumus adimplendum, in quo ſuum mandatum eſt, & Apoſtolorum obſervatio. *De Eccleſiaſt. Offic. l. 3. c. 24.*

" Inſtitution.) He adds, That (t) *though* Cyprian *concluded this only of the mixture of Wine and Water, yet may we underſtand it as a thing to be fulfilled in the whole Inſtitution of the Lord, in which is his command, and the Apoſtles obſervation of it.*

§. 6. Now ſurely they who thought themſelves obliged to mix Water with their Wine, becauſe it was *according to our Saviour's Inſtitution*, and *doing of this Action as our Lord delivered it*, and was *according to the Canons and Practice of the Church*, muſt alſo think themſelves obliged for the very ſame reaſons to Miniſter the Cup unto the People preſent at their Sacraments, and ſay unto them as our Saviour did, *Drink ye all of this.*

They who believed they were by no means *to recede from our Lord's Inſtitution in this matter*, could never think it fit to recede from it in the delivery of the Cup.

They who decreed *the Depoſition* of thoſe *Biſhops* or *Prieſts*, who did neglect this mixture, as *imperfectly ſhewing forth this Myſtery*, would more aſſuredly have for that reaſon, depoſed thoſe who robbed the People of the Cup; for ſince, according
1 Cor. xi. 26. to St. *Paul*, we *ſhew forth the Lord's Death, by eating of this Bread, and drinking of this Cup*: It clearly follows, that if he who gives Wine without Water does but imperfectly ſhew forth the Myſtery to them who do receive it, he that neither gives conſecrated Wine nor Water, muſt do it more imperfectly.

They who declared againſt the offering of Water only as a thing unlawful, *becauſe all Chriſtians were obliged to obſerve the Tradition of the Lord, offering the Cup, and miniſtring it to the People*; and to *imitate what Chriſt did*, unleſs they would be thought *contemners of Chriſt's diſcipline*, muſt alſo think themſelves obliged to obſerve the ſame *Tradition* and *Example*, in miniſtring the Cup, and Cenſure in like manner thoſe who do it not.

They who teach, that *not the Cuſtom of Man, but the Truth of God* was to be followed, could never have approved of the plea from Cuſtom, uſed by the *Church* of *Rome*, for defalcation of the Cup.

And

And laſtly, they who looked upon the Inſtitution as *a Command*, and all theſe ſayings of St. *Cyprian*, as Rules to be fulfilled, and followed in the whole inſtitution of our *Lord*, muſt alſo think it a *Command* to miniſter the Cup unto the People; and that thoſe Rules of *Cyprian* did bind them ſo to do. I therefore ſhall conclude this Chapter with that ſaying of *Algerus* *, in the caſe of unleavened Bread. *Who dares except what Chriſt excepted not, or forbid what he in his Sacraments did not forbid, but doing it himſelf*, commanded us to do the ſame thing, *when he ſaith, do this, we are conveniently to underſtand this which I do, but who dares alſo to underſtand this, but do it not of that which I do it? Moreover, if Unleavened Bread be to be changed for Leavened, let the Wine alſo be changed for any other liquor; for as our Lord Chriſt finiſhed the Old Paſſover, and began the New with Unleavened Bread, ſo did he alſo do it with Wine, and* delivered both to us to be equally celebrated in this Sacrament.

* Quis audet excipere, quod ipſe non excepit, aut quis audit prohibere quod ipſe in Sacramento ſuo non prohibuit; ſed ipſe faciens, nos hoc ipſum facere præcepit, cum dicit, Hoc facite, convenienter ſubaudiatur, quod Ego; quis æque competenter ſubaudire audeat, ſed non de hoc unde ego, item ſi mutandum eſt fermentato azymum, mutetur etiam quolibet alio liquore vinum, ſi enim vinum recipitur, cur azymum refutetur, cum ſicut ex azymo, ſic ex vino Chriſtus vetus paſcha finierit, & novum inchoaverit, & utrumque nobis in *Sacramento ſuo* æque celebrandum tradiderit? *Algerus de Sacram. Euch. lib.* 2. *c.* 10. *fol.* 84. *b.* 85. *a.*

CHAP. III.

The Contents.

In oppoſition to the Decree of the Trent *Council, aſſerting that they who receive in one kind only are not deprived of any Grace neceſſary to Salvation: The Fathers declare,* 1. *That it is neceſſary to partake of the Cup, in order to our Union to Chriſt,* §. 1. *For the Remiſſion of Sins,* §. 2. *For the obtainment of Eternal Life,* §. 3. *An inference from this laſt Particular, to ſhew the falſhood of one Anathema pronounced by the* Trent *Council,* §. 4.

IT is ſure ſome prejudice againſt this *Novel* Doctrine, and Practice of the *Church* of *Rome*, ſome ground to ſcruple and ſuſpect the lawfulneſs of the ſubſtraction of the *Cup*, that it bears ſuch a manifeſt repugnance to our *Lord*'s inſtitution, and

to that Repetition of it which St. *Paul* delivered as a thing carefully to be obſerved; a Tradition to be retained by the *Church* of *Corinth*; and by attendance to which all their miſcarriages, in reference to the Celebration of that Myſtery, were to be corrected: That all the *Fathers* of the *Church* above a Thouſand Years conceived themſelves obliged, by virtue of this Inſtitution, to Miniſter both ſpecies to the People. That they on all occaſions roſe up with ſuch an holy Zeal againſt thoſe perſons who in leſſer matters preſumed to vary from this Inſtitution, condemned all humane Inſtitutions which receded from it, and puniſh'd all Offenders in this kind. But ſuch hath been the Providence of God in reference to this Affair, ſuch the diſcourſes of the *Ancients*, with reſpect unto this ſubject, that there is ſcarcely any other Poſition advanced by theſe *Councils* in favour of this Doctrine and Practice of the *Church* of *Rome*, which they do not directly overthrow, or in plain words condemn, almoſt as fully as any *Proteſtant* can do. For,

Seſſ. 21. cap. 3. Seſſ. 13. Can. 3. *Thirdly*, Whereas it is defined by the *Trent Council*, that *they are not deprived of any Grace neceſſary to Salvation, who receive one kind only*; and that *it cannot be doubted, without prejudice to the Chriſtian Faith, but that Communion in one kind only is ſufficient to Salvation.* The *Fathers* do, in oppoſition to theſe Aſſertions, plainly and frequently declare, That it is neceſſary to Salvation for *Chriſtians* in the general, to drink Chriſt's Blood in the Sacrament. This will be evident,

1. From theſe Expreſſions, in which the *Fathers* do declare it neceſſary, not only to partake of the Bread, but alſo of the Cup, in order to that *Union* with *Chriſt* which ſure is neceſſary to Salvation; and this they generally gather from thoſe words of Chriſt, *He that eateth my Fleſh, and* drinketh *my Blood dwelleth in me, and I in him. The Doctrine of bleſſed* Paul, ſaith *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem, is ſufficient to afford us full ſatisfaction touching the Holy Myſteries, of which being made partakers, we become of the ſame body and blood with Chriſt; for ſo he ſaith, that our Lord Jeſus, taking Bread, and giving Thanks, he brake, and gave it to his Diſciples, ſaying, Take, eat, this is my Body; and taking the Cup, and giving Thanks, he ſaid, Take, and drink, for this is my Blood; for in the type of Bread, the Body, and in the type of Wine, the Blood is given to thee:* (a) *That partaking of the Body and Blood*

Joh. vi. 56.

(a) Ἵνα γένῃ μεταλαβὼν σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ σύσσωμα καὶ σύναιμος αὐτοῦ. Catech. Myſt. 4. p. 237.

of

of Chriſt, thou maiſt be of one Body and Blood with him, for ſo we are made χειροφόροι, *bearers of Chriſt; his Body and Blood being received into our members.* (*b*) *Thoſe things being taken and drank,* ſaith *Hilary*, *produce this effect, that Chriſt is in us, and we in Chriſt; and how natural this Unity is, he himſelf teacheth, ſaying, He that eats my Fleſh and* drinks *my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. Cyril* of *Alexandria* on theſe words ſaith, That (*c*) *our Lord here ſhews the great profitableneſs of this work; for, as if one join Wax to Wax, he will ſee one part within the other; ſo, he that receives the Fleſh of our Saviour Chriſt, and* drinks *his Blood, is, as he ſaith, found one with him. So mixed with and in him, that he is found in Chriſt, and Chriſt again in him. Oecumenius* upon theſe words, *The Cup of Bleſſing, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt?* ſaith thus, *You know what I ſay,* (*d*) *for his Blood knits us to Chriſt as Members to the Head, by the participation of it. This Meat and Drink,* ſaith Rabanus Maurus, *ſignifies the eternal ſociety of the Head and Members: He that* drinketh, *ſaith he, my Blood, and eateth my Fleſh, dwelleth in me,* &c. (*e*) *wherefore 'tis neceſſary that we ſhould take the Body and Blood of Chriſt, that we may dwell in him, and be his Members. Whoſoever worthily eateth the Body and the Blood of Chriſt, ſhews that he is in God, and God in him.* And *we,* ſaith (*f*) Guitmund, *who take the Communion of this Holy Bread and Cup, are made one Body with Chriſt. Theophylact* upon the Tenth to the *Corinthians*, adds, *That which he ſaith is this, That which is in the Cup is that which flowed from his ſide, and* (*g*) *by participation of it we communicate with, that is, we are united to Chriſt: That Men might not only learn by words,* ſaith (*h*) Petrus Cluniacenſis, *that they cannot live unleſs they be joined and united to Chriſt after the manner of carnal Food and Life, they receive the Body of Chriſt, and drink the Blood of Chriſt. We,* ſaith (*i*) St. *Bernard, by the Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, are joined in an ineffable Unity to Chriſt, and Chriſt to us, as he ſaid, He that eateth my Fleſh and drinks my Blood, abideth in me, and I in him.*

(*b*) Hæc accepta & hauſta, id efficiunt, ut & nos in Chriſto, & Chriſtus in nobis ſit. *De Trin. l.* 8. *p.* 166.

(*c*) *In* Joh 6. 56.

(*d*) Συνάπτει γὰρ ἡμᾶς τῷ Χριστῷ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ὡς μίλη τῇ κεφαλῇ διὰ τ μεταλήψεως. Ed. Gr. *p.* 444.

(*e*) Neceſſe habemus ſumere corpus & ſanguinem ejus, ut in ipſo maneamus & ejus corporis membra ſimus. *De inſt. cler. l.* 1. *cap.* 31.

(*f*) Lib. 2. f. 55. *b.*

(*g*) Ἐκεῖνο μεταλαμβάνοντες κοινωνοῦμεν, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἑνούμεθα τῷ Χριστῷ. Ad v. 16.

(*h*) Ed. Eraſm. *p.* 217.

(*i*) Et nos Jeſu Chriſto & Jeſus Chriſtus nobis unitate fœderatur inenarrabili, &c. *De cœna Domini, f.* 320. *b.*

§. 2. 2. This will be further evident from those Expressions in which they say, That the receiving of the Cup is necessary for the *Remission of Sins*, for *without* this *Remission there is no Salvation. When thou receivest*, saith St. *Ambrose*, *What saith the Apostle to thee? As often as we eat this Bread and drink this Cup, we shew forth the Lord's Death; if we shew forth his Death, we shew forth the Remission of Sins; and* (k) *if as often as this Blood is poured forth, it is done for the Remission of Sins*, I ought *always to receive it, that my Sins may always be forgiven, for as oft as thou drinkest thou receivest Remission of Sins.* Now this Passage being cited, and approved by many others in the following Ages, and extant in the (l) *Canon Law*, it will be needless to cite more *Authors* to this purpose, only let it be noted, that to receive the Blood shed for the Remission of our Sins, is to *drink* of it, saith St. *Ambrose*, and well he might, no other way of receiving the Blood, shed for the Remission of Sins, being then known, than that of drinking the Sacramental Cup.

(k) Si quotiescunque effunditur sanguis in remissionem peccatorum funditur, debeo illum semper accipere, ut semper mihi peccata dimittantur, qui semper pecco, semper debeo habere medicinam. *De Sacr. l. 4. c. 6. l. 5. cap. 3.*

(l) Dist. 2. c. 14. Can. de consecrat.

§. 3. 3. They do expresly teach, That the Sacramental eating and drinking is ordinarily necessary to eternal Life. (m) *Without any doubting or shamefaced fear, eat Christ's Body, and* drink *his Blood*, saith *Nazianzen*, *if thou desirest Life. Gregory Nyssen* condemns *Eunomius* for asserting, That *the Mystical Symbols did not confirm our Piety; But we*, saith he, *who have learned from the Holy Scriptures, That unless a Man be born again of Water*, &c. *and that he who eats my Flesh, and drinks my Blood shall live for ever:* (n) *We believe that our Salvation is corroborated by the Mystical Rites and Symbols.* (o) *This Blood all Men are exhorted to* drink *who would have Life*, saith St. *Austin. Charles* the *Great* confuting the vain Imaginations of the Second *Nicene Council*, and comparing the sacred Blood with *Images*, speaks thus, (p) *Seeing without the participation of this Blood no Man can be saved, whereas all Orthodox Persons may be saved without the observation of Images, It is manifest, that they are by no Man of a sound Mind, to be compared or equalled to so great a Mystery.*

(m) Πίνε τὸ αἷμα εἰ τῆς ζωῆς ἐπιθυμητικὸς ἔχεις. Orat. 42.

(n) Καὶ τὴν τῶν μυστικῶν ἐθῶν τε καὶ συμβόλων κοινωνίαν τῆς σωτηρίαν κεκλήνεσθαι. Tom. 2. contr. Eunom. p. 704.

(o) In Levit. qu. 47.

(p) L. de Imag. 2. c. 27.

Alcuin,

Alcuin, the Maſter of *Charles* the *Great* ſaith, *We muſt know that it is not lawful to offer the Cup of the Lord's Blood unmixed with Water; for Wine was in the Myſtery of our Redemption, when Chriſt ſaid, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the Vine; and the Water with Blood, flowing from his ſide, ſhewed the Wine preſſed out of the true Vine of his Fleſh with Water;* (q) for theſe are the Sacraments of the Church, without which we cannot enter into Life. (r) *Amalarius* ſaith the ſame. And *our Lord*, ſaith (s) *Rabanus Maurus*, *having pronounced concerning his Body and Blood, that his Fleſh is Meat indeed, and his Blood Drink indeed; and that he that eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, hath Eternal Life; he therefore hath not that Life who eateth not that Bread, and drinketh not that Blood; for although Men, who are not in his Body by Faith, may have that Life in this World which is Temporal, they can never have that Eternal Life which is promiſed to the Saints.*

(q) Hæc enim ſunt Sacramenta Eccleſiæ ſine quibus ad vitam non intratur. *De Celeb. Miſ.* p. 88.

(r) De Officiis Eccleſ. l. 3. c. 26.

(s) De Inſtit. Cler. l. 1. c. 31.

Chriſt, ſaith (t) *Petrus Cluniacenſis*, *gives his Fleſh and Blood to be eaten and drunken, that as it is diſcerned that without carnal Meat and drink, none can paſs through this temporal Life; ſo it may be believed that without this ſpiritual Meat and Drink, none can obtain eternal Life; for how could he better commend himſelf to the World to be the Life of Men, than by Example of thoſe things in which Man's Life conſiſts? and therefore the Wiſdom of God decreed to give his Fleſh to Men to eat, and his Blood to drink in the ſpecies of thoſe things; when he ſaith, I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life, &c. we learn by hearing, that he is Eternal Life; but when he ſaith, except you eat my Fleſh, &c. we learn by eating, that he is the Eternal Life of Men. That Men therefore might not only learn by Words, but more familiarly by Deeds, that they cannot Live, except they be united to him, they take the Body, they drink the Blood, in the likeneſs of Food, not given by, or taken from any other but Chriſt; to ſhew this, he ſignified that he would give to all Men his Fleſh to eat, and his Blood to drink.*

(t) Fol. 216. b.

And, truly, if any Doctrine can deſerve to be ſuſpected, as new, ſtrange, and incongruous to the Analogy of Faith, it muſt be this, That *the Cup of Life, the Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs, the Cup of Salvation*, which we take according to our Lord's own Inſtitution, and which we drink of Worthily, is not needful to conferr Life, Salvation, or ſpiritual Bleſſing on the

the worthy Receiver of it. That in all the *Liturgies* of the *Ancient Church*, they should pray constantly, that they who worthily Received this Cup, might be *filled thereby with all spiritual Benediction, and heavenly Grace*; that in their Discourses on this Subject, they should exhort the People, after they had received the Bread, to drink this Cup for their *Sanctification*, for the *remission of Sins*, for the *obtaining Life*; and tell them it was necessary to be drunk of, for all the ends here mentioned, and yet believe it was not needful to conferr Grace, and spiritualy Blessings on them.

And 4*ly*, This they do generally prove from the Fifth Century, by that known passage of our Lord, *Except you eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of the Son of Man, you have no Life in you.* (*u*) St. *Basil* is express unto this purpose, saying, That *the Baptized person ought to be nourished with the food of Eternal Life; and that the communication of the Body and Blood of Christ is necessary to Eternal Life:* And proving both from these words, *Verily I say unto you, except you eat*, &c. *He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath Eternal Life.* St. *Chrysostom* upon this Text, speaks thus, *Because they had said before, it was impossible to eat his Flesh, and drink his Blood.* (*x*) *He here shews, not only that it is not impossible, but that it is very necessary; and therefore introduceth these words, He that eateth my Flesh*, &c. *He continually speaks of the* Mysteries, *shewing the necessity of the thing, and that it always ought to be done. Against the* Pelagians, saith *P. Gelasius*, (*y*) *our Lord pronounceth that he who eateth not the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drinks his Blood, hath no Life in him; where we see none exempt, nor dares any say, that an Infant can obtain Eternal Life without this Sacrament --- It is not only said, Except a Man be born again of Water*, &c. *but unless, He eat --- and drink*, &c. *and that this is spoken of Eternal Life none can doubt; because many who receive not this Sacrament, have this present Life.* St. *Austin* Asserts above Twenty times, the absolute necessity that Infants should partake of Christ's Body, and drink his Blood, by reason of these words (*z*) *Christ*, saith

(*u*) Tom. 1. p. 580. Tom. 2. p. 431.

(*x*) Δείκνυσιν αὐτὸς οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἀδύνατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σφόδρα ἀναγκαῖον--δείκνυς τοῦ πράγματος τὸ ἀναγκαῖον, καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸ πάντως γένεσθαι δεῖ. Tom. 2. p. 748.

(*y*) Dominus Jesus (contra Pelagianos) cœlesti voce pronunciat, Qui non manducaverit, &c. Ubi utique neminem videmus exemptum, nec ausus est aliquis dicere parvulum sine hoc Sacramento salutari ad æternam vitam posse produci— *Ep. Univ. Episc. per Nicænum. Concil. Tom. 4. p.* 1177, 1178.

(*z*) Omnino & parvulorum salvator est Christus, omnino nisi ab illo redimantur peribunt, quum sine carne ejus & sanguine vitam habere non possunt, hoc sensit, hoc credidit, hoc didicit, hoc docuit Joannes. *Tom. 7. l. 1. contra Jul. Pelag. ed. Frob. p.* 949.

ſaith he, *is altogether the Saviour of Infants, and unleſs they be redeemed by him, they will utterly periſh, ſeeing without his Fleſh and Blood they cannot have Life.* This St. John *thought and believed, learned and taught.* And again, (*a*) *when Chriſt ſaith, Unleſs you eat his Fleſh and drink his Blood you have no life in you, can I ſay the Child can have Life, who ends his Life without that Sacrament?* And a third time, *He having ſaid, Unleſs you eat,* &c. *and he that eats my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood hath eternal Life:* (*b*) *How is it that you* (Pelagians) *promiſe the Kingdom of Heaven to Children not born of Water and the Spirit, not fed with the Fleſh of Chriſt, nor having drunk of his Blood which was ſhed for the Remiſſion of their Sins? Behold, he that is not Baptized, and he that is deprived of the* Vital Cup *and Bread, is divided from the Kingdom of Heaven.* And of what Sacrament he conceives our *Saviour* to have ſpoken in theſe words, he more expreſly tells us, ſaying, (*c*) *Let us hear our Lord ſpeaking, not of the Sacrament of Baptiſm,* N. B. *but of the Sacrament of his Holy Table, to which none comes who is not rightly Baptized, Except you eat —— and drink,* &c. *What do we farther ſeek for? Dares any Body ſay, this Sentence belongeth not to Children, or that they can have Life in themſelves, without the Participation of the Body and the Blood of Chriſt? But he that ſaith this, doth not attend, that if that Sentence comprehends not all, ſo that they cannot have Life without the Body and the Blood of Chriſt, thoſe of Riper Years are not obliged to regard it:* And to refer you to the (*d*) Margin for the reſt, his Concluſion is this, (*e*) *If then ſo many divine Teſtimonies accord in ſaying, That neither Salvation nor Life eternal is by any to be hoped for, without Baptiſm, and the Body and the Blood of our Lord, they are in vain promiſed to Children without them.* Now here it is to be admired, that Men of Sence and of Integrity, ſhould ſay, St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks all this *of ſuch a participation of the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, as may be had in Baptiſm,* when he not only ſpeaks in divers of

(*a*) An dicente Chriſto, Si non manducaveritis, &c. dicturus fueram parvulum habiturum vitam qui ſine iſto Sacramento finiiſſet hanc vitam. *Ibid. l.* 3. *c.* 1. *p.* 991. d. 992. a.

(*b*) Quo igitur vitam regni cœlorum promittitis parvulis non renatis ex aqua & ſpiritu Sancto, non cibatis carne neque potatis ſanguine Chriſti? *Where the Marginal Note is,* Euchariſtia parvulis ſub utraque ſpecie. *Tom.* 7. *contr. Pelag. Hypognoſt. c.* 5. *p.* 1405. b. c.

(*c*) Dominum audiamus non quidem hoc de Sacramento ſancti lavacri dicentem, ſed de Sacramento ſacræ menſæ ſuæ, quo nemo niſi rite baptizatus accedit, Niſi manducaveritis, &c. *Tom.* 7. *l. de peccat. Meritis & Remiſſ. c.* 19. *p.* 666.

(*d*) Vide Dallæum de Cult. Latin. l. 5. cap. 3.

(*e*) Si ergo, ut tot, & tanta divina teſtimonia concinant, nec ſalus, nec vita æterna ſine baptiſmo & corpore & ſanguine Domini cuiquam ſperanda eſt, fruſtra fine his promittitur parvulis. *Lib.* 1. *de peccat. Meritis & Remiſſ. c.* 24. *p.* 670.

theſe

these places first of the Sacrament of Baptism, and after of the Supper of the Lord, but sometimes of this Sacrament by way of distinction from that of Baptism, sometimes of the Sacrament of the *Lord's Table*, and of that eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood, *quod per corpus geritur, which is done by the Body.* And when this Text from the Fifth to the Twelfth *Century*, was by the *Fathers* still interpreted of the *Lord's Supper*, and Children were admitted to that Sacrament, and to the drinking of the Cup on that account. *Isidore Peleusiota* in the same Age extolling the *Sacerdotal* Order, saith, That *by their means we are regenerated, (f) and made partakers of the divine* Mysteries, *without which no Man can attain the Heavenly rewards, as is apparent from the Heavenly Oracles, now saying, That unless a Man be born again,* &c. *and anon, Unless we eat,* &c. *we have no life in us:* Which Argument he seems to have borrowed from St. *Chrysostom*, who saith, (g) *If none can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven who is not born again of Water,* &c. *If he that doth not eat the Flesh of the Lord, and drink his Blood, is deprived of Eternal Life, and all these things are not otherwise communicated, but by the Hands of the Priest, who can, without these Men avoid the Fire of Hell, or enjoy the Crowns laid up in Heaven? Amphilochius* saith, (h) *It is impossible that any one should be saved, unless he be regenerated by Baptism, and made partaker of the Life-giving Antitypes of the Body and Blood of Christ.* (i) *Isidore Hispalensis* cites, and approves that passage of (k) St. *Cyprian*, in his Treatise on the *Lord's Prayer, It is to be feared, least any one, being long separated from the Body of Christ, should be far from Salvation; Christ having said, Unless you eat,* &c. *Hincmarus Remensis* saith, That Christ spoke those words *of his Body and Blood inviting his Servants to his Table,* that (l) *this, and Baptism are the Sacraments of the* Church, *without which we cannot enter into true Life.* (m) *Rabanus* speaks thus, *The Truth*

(f) Τῶν θείων μετέχομεν μυστηρίων ὧν ἄνευ τῶν οὐρανίων μετάσχειν οὐκ ἔστι τε γερῶν. l. 2. Ep. 52.

(g) Hom. 3. de Sacerd. tom. 6. p. 16. l. 38.

(h) Ἐι μὴ μετάσχει τῶν ζωοποιῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ. In Vit. Basil. c. 17. p. 221.

(i) De Ecclesiast. Officiis, l. 1. de Sacrificio, c. 18.

(k) Timendum est ne dum qui abstentus seperatur a Christi corpore procul remaneat a salute, comminante ipso vel dicente, Nisi ederitis carnem filii hominis & biberitis sanguinem ejus, non habebitis vitam in vobis. *Cypr. de Orat. Dom. p.* 147. *Et Raban. Maur. de institut. Cler. l.* 1. *c.* 31. (l) Locutus est nobis de corpore & sanguine suo, commendans talem escam, & talem potum, Nisi manducaveritis, &c. hæc sunt Sacramenta Ecclesiæ sine quibus ad vitam quæ vera vita est non intratur. *Tom.* 2. *p.* 92. (m) Habet vitam æternam; hanc ergo non habet qui istum panem non manducat, nec istum sanguinem bibit, nam temporalem vitam sine illo habere homines possunt, æternam vero omnino non possunt. *August. Tract.* 26. *in Joh. p.* 229. Sinc isto cibo & potu. *Raban. M. de instit. Cler. l.* 1. 31.

saith,

ſaith, My Fleſh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed. —— Men may have temporal Life without this Meat and Drink, eternal they can never have. Which Words he borrowed from St. *Auſtin*'s Comment on the Sixth of *John*. *Regino* cites this paſſage from the *Capitulars* of *Charles* the *Great*, That (*n*) *great diſcretion is to be uſed as to the Receiving of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, for care is to be taken, leaſt being deferred too long, it tend to the Deſtruction of the Soul, our Lord having ſaid, Unleſs you eat,* &c. (*o*) *Humbert* in his Diſputation againſt the *Greeks*, ſaith, That *Chriſt teſtified with an Oath, that without this refection, that Life which is Chriſt cannot be had, ſaying, Verily I ſay unto you, except,* &c. *The Fleſh is taken by it ſelf,* ſaith Lanfranck, *and the Blood by it ſelf, not without a certain Myſtery, though in another Sence whole Chriſt is ſaid to be eaten, viz.* By ſpiritual deſire of eternal Life, and Meditation of his Paſſion; (*p*) *both theſe Comeſtions* are neceſſary —— *for hence it is read in the Goſpel, that unleſs we eat,* &c. (*q*) *Rupertus Tuitienſis* ſaith, That *leaſt any Man ſhould think he hath recovered by Faith alone, the Life of his Body and Soul, without the viſible meat and drink of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and conſequently needs not the Sacrament, Chriſt repeats the ſame thing again touching the eating his Fleſh and drinking his Blood; by this undoubtedly teſtifying that he doth not truly believe, whoſoever deſpiſeth to eat and to drink; for although thou be a Faithful Man, and profeſs thy ſelf to be a Catholick, if thou refuſeſt to eat of this viſible Meat and Drink, even by this, that thou preſumeſt that this Meat and Drink is not neceſſary to thee, thou cutteſt thy ſelf off from the Society of the Members of Chriſt, which is the Church.*

(*n*) De Eccl. diſcipl. l. 1. can. 195.

(*o*) Quaſi quodam jurejurando proteſtatur dicens, Amen, Amen, &c. *Apud Baron. Tom.* 11. *p.* 1007.

(*p*) Utraque comeſtio neceſſaria, utraque fructuoſa, altera indiget alterius, ut boni aliquid operetur — hinc in Evangelio legitur niſi manducaveritis, &c. *De Sacr. Euch. p.* 126, 127.

(*q*) Comment. in 6. Joh.

§. 4. Now if that ſence which the conſtant interpretation of the *Fathers* hath put upon theſe words, from the Fifth to the Twelfth *Century* be owned by *Romaniſts*, the conſequence is unavoidable, that it is neceſſary to Salvation to receive the Sacrament under both kinds, for they who do receive the Body only, may be ſaid well to eat the Fleſh of Chriſt, becauſe they take ſomething by way of Meat, but they cannot be ſaid to *drink his Blood*, as here our *Lord* requireth them to do, ſince they take nothing by way of drink. The privation of Life is here connected with the neglect of Drinking, as much as with the

neglect of Eating; since therefore eating and drinking are distinct Actions, he cannot properly be said to drink, who only eats, and therefore must neglect what, by the *Fathers* descants on these Words, is necessary to life eternal. Moreover, since on this sole account they constantly did minister the Cup to little Children, as *Roman Catholicks* confess, they ministred both the Bread and Cup to Children capable of receiving both, as the *Church History* attests; it follows that they held it necessary to Salvation in conformity to these Sayings of our *Lord* recorded by St. *John*, that both should be received by all *Christians* capable of taking both Species. And therefore in condemning this Doctrine, and that with an *Anathema*, the *Fathers* of the *Trent Council* must have virtually *Anathematized* the whole *Church* of *Christ* for Nine whole *Centuries*, and by renouncing of this Interpretation so generally received, the *Doctors* of the *Roman Church* must at least seem to us to violate that Oath, which they have taken, never to interpret or own any sence of Scripture, *Nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum, but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.*

Sess. 21. can. 4.

Juramentum professionis fidei a Pio 4. editum.

CHAP. IV.

The Contents.

In opposition to that Determination of the Trent *Council, That a true or an intire Sacrament is taken under either Species. The Fathers and the School-Men do expresly say the contrary*, viz. Epiphanius, §. 1. *The Council held in* Trullo, P. Julius, P. Gelasius, *the Council of* Braga, §. 2. Paschasius Corbeiensis, Algerus *and St.* Bernard, §. 3. Alexander Halensis, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Albertus Magnus, Durantus, Petrus de Palude, Gulielmus de monte Laudano, Lyra, Carthusianus, Andreas Frisius, §. 4. *The Inferences from these Sayings*, §. 5.

Sess. 21. cap. 3. l. 4. de Sacr. Ench. c. 22. s. utraque.

WHereas the *Trent Council* asserts, That *a true Sacrament is taken under either Species*, that is, as *Bellarmine* Interprets it, *An intire Sacrament*; nothing is more repugnant to the plain Judgment of Antiquity than these Assertions. And though

though the silence of all Antiquity in this matter is a full demonstration that they held no such Doctrine, seeing no reason can be given why they; had they embraced this Doctrine, which is frequently inculcated by all the *Roman Doctors*, who write upon this Subject, should never say with the like plainness, as they so often do, That *an entire Sacrament is given under one Species only*, or any thing to that effect; or give themselves the trouble to Answer that Enquiry which so disturbs the *Roman Doctors*, and which they see themselves so much concerned to Answer; *viz. Why then did our dear Lord himself distribute and institute this Sacrament to be received under both kinds?* I say, though this be a sufficient prejudice against that Assertion of the *Council* of *Trent*; and though it will more fully be confuted by an impartial Reflection on what we have Discoursed, of the constant Declaration of the *Church*, that to give the consecrated Bread dipp'd in the Cup was not to give a compleat Sacrament, with many things of the like nature; yet shall I wave all these Advantages at present, and shew from the plain Sayings, both of the *Ancients*, the Writers of the *middle*, and chiefly of the *latter Ages*, or the Doctrine of the *Schools*, that they conceived the Reception of both Species by persons capable, was requisite to the integrity of this Sacrament.

§. 1.

Epiphanius speaking of the *Encratites*, saith, That *in this Mystery they use only Water, and wholly do abstain from Wine*; the censure which he passeth on them for so doing, is this, That *having the Form, they deny the Power of Godliness*; (a) *for whosoever*, saith he, *doth omit one part of a work, by the omission of that one part, doth really omit the whole.* The Inference he maketh from that Rule is this, That *the Mysteries they celebrate by Water only, are really no Mysteries, but only false Mysteries in imitation of the true, in which they are convinced by the Right words of our Saviour, saying, I will not henceforth drink of the Fruit of the Vine.*

(a) Ὁποίου γὰρ ἄν τις ἔργου καταλείψῃ μέρος, τὸ πᾶν πλήρωμα ἀφῆκε διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς μέρους τοῦ καταλελειμένου, ὅθεν τὰ παρ' αὐτοῖς μυστήρια δι' ὕδατος μόνον γίνεται, καὶ ἔτι μυστήρια ὄντα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν ἀληθινῶν τὰ ψεύδη γινόμενα, ὅθεν καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἐλεγχθήσονται ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐθέως τοῦ σωτῆρος λόγου τοῦ λέγοντος, οὐ μὴ πιὼ, &c. Hær. 47. §. 3. Pag. 401.

§. 2.

The *General Council* held in *Trullo* being informed that the *Armenians* did celebrate the Mysteries in pure Wine not mixed

 with

(*b*) Can. 32. with Water, declares that they did (*b*) ἁπλῶς τὸ μυστήριον καταγγελλεῖν, *imperfectly ſhew forth the Myſtery.* Now let it be obſerved from St. *Paul*, that it is not by offering only, but by partaking of this Bread, and drinking of this Cup, that we do καταγγελλεῖν, *ſhew forth the Lord's Death*, and then it clearly follows, that if he who diſtributes *Wine without Water*, imperfectly ſhews forth the Myſtery, he that gives neither Wine nor Water muſt do it more imperfectly. When ſome in the *Dioceſs* of *Squillaci* out of ſome unknown Superſtition, would have taken the Bread without the Cup, (*c*) *Gelaſius* decrees, that they ſhould either take the entire Sacrament, or be entirely driven from it; he therefore evidently determined, that taking of one Species only was not taking an *entire Sacrament.* In the Fourth Century, (*d*) *Pope Julius*, in the Seventh *Council* of *Braga*, in the Eleventh *Micrologus*, in the Twelfth *Peter Lombard*, do with one voice deny that the Bread dipp'd in the conſecrated Wine can be adminiſtred, *pro complemento Communionis, for an entire or compleat Communion*, and therefore much leſs could they think that the Communion was entire when miniſtred only in dry Bread.

(*c*) Apud Ivon. decret. part 2. c. 89.

(*d*) See cap. 2. §. 2.

§. 3. The great Sticklers for *Tranſubſtantiation* averr the ſame thing. (*e*) *Paſchaſius Corbeienſis* ſaith, That (*e*) *therefore we are fed with, and made to drink of theſe two only in the way, that our whole Man, which conſiſts of two Subſtances*, integrè reparetur, *may be entirely repaired*, both therefore were, in his judgment, needful to an entire reparation of the whole Man. *Algerus* in Anſwer to this Queſtion, *Why the Body and Blood of Chriſt is conſecrated rather in Bread, Wine and Water, than in any other kinds of Bodies?* ſaith, That *becauſe we ſo live by Bread and drink, that we can want neither of them, (f) our Lord would have both be in his Sacrament, leaſt if either of them ſhould be wanting, as by this imperfect ſign of Life, he ſhould ſeem to be repreſented not as full, but as imperfect Life.* And a little after he ſaith, *This is done* propter commodiorem aptitudinem Sacramentalis perfectionis, *for the more commodious repreſentation of the Sacramental perfection. The Species of Bread and Wine is propounded*, ſaith (*g*) St. *Bernard*, *that it might be taught, that there is a full and perfect refection in taking the Body and the Blood of Chriſt; a full refection of Meat and Drink, the principal Subſtances of Meat and Drink being Bread and Wine.*

(*e*) De Corp. & Sang. Dom. c. 11.

(*f*) Utrumq; in Sacramento ſuo eſſe voluit. De Sacr. Euch. l. 2. c. 5.

(*g*) De cœna Domini f. 321. b.

But

§. 4.

But above all the *School-Men* do declare against this Doctrine of the *Trent Council*. (*b*) *Alexander* of *Hales* saith, That *whole Christ is not under either Species Sacramentally, but the Flesh only under the Species of Bread, the Blood under the Species of Wine only; for to the perfection of the Sacrament is required a representation according to the Institution, but in one kind the matter of the Sacrament is not entirely and perfectly; I say there is not a perfect Sacrament, as to the Sacramental Perfection of it.* (*i*) *Aquinas* saith, That *though Christ is contained under both Species, yet is it convenient to the use of this Sacrament, that the Body of Christ should be delivered apart for Food to the Faithful, and his Blood for Drink; both*, saith he, *is of the perfection of this Sacrament, for the perfection of refection, for the representation of Christs Passion, and for the effecting of the Salvation both of Soul and Body.* 1. For its perfection; *for it being a Spiritual Refection, it ought to have spiritual Meat and spiritual Drink; for corporal Refection is not perfected without both these*: And as he elsewhere saith, *because spiritual effects are done under the likeness of visible, it was fit that this spiritual nourishment should be delivered to us under the Species of those things which Men do ordinarily use for corporal nourishment; and therefore this Sacrament is delivered to us under the Species of Bread and Wine.* 2. For the signification of it; *for it is a memorial of the Lord's Passion, whereby his Blood was separated from his Body; and therefore in this Sacrament the Blood is offered by it self.* And elsewhere, *Because the Completion of our Salvation was made by the Passion and Death of Christ, by which his Blood was separated from his Flesh*; separatim nobis traditur Sacramentum corporis ejus sub specie panis, & sanguis sub specie vini; *the Sacrament of his Body is delivered* N. B. *to us apart under the Species of Bread, and the Blood under the Species of Wine, that so in this Sacrament might be the memory and representation of our Lord's Passion.* 3. For the healthful Effect of it; *for the Body is offered to shew that it is of force to save the Body, and the Blood is offered to shew that it is of force to save the Soul; for the Soul is in the Blood.* (*k*) *Bonaventure* saith, That, *as to the signification, both Species are of the integrity of this Sacrament, because the matter of the Sacrament is expressed in neither of them by it self, but in both together, which appears thus; Here Christ is signified as Meat, perfectly refreshing them that eat him*

(*b*) In iv. sent. q. 40. membr. 3. Art 2. & q. 53. membr. 1.

(*i*) Sum. part. 3. q. 76. Art. 2. Adv. Gent. l. 4. c. 61. & in 1. Cor. c. 11.

(*k*) In 4. Sent. dist. 8. q. 2. & dist. 11. q. 2.

him Sacramentally and Spiritually; but a perfect Refection is not in Bread alone or Wine alone, but in both; he therefore is signified as perfectly refreshing not in one Species only but in both. And again, *This Sacrament, though it contains two Signs, and two Words, yet because a perfect Sign ordained for one thing,* &c. *the Union of the Body Mystical, results from them, therefore the Sacrament is one; and the reason of this Integrity and Ordination comes from Nature, for neither is Bread nor Wine apart fully Refectory, but both, and one full Refection in nature comes from both, and so they are disposed to signifie one Refection; but this is compleated by the Divine Institution, which by one Institution hath appointed these two Signs to signifie one perfect Refection, and so it is one Sacrament on the account of nature and of Divine Institution.*

(l) In 4. Sent. dist. 8. Art. 13.

(l) *Albertus Magnus* lays down this general Rule, *The Sacrament of the Church causeth nothing in Grace which it doth not signifie in Similitude,* and that *the Sacraments of the New Law are the cause of nothing of which they bear not a sensible Image*; and thence infers, That *the Union of the Mystical Body is not perfectly caused, and signified but by a double Sign; and therefore by virtue of the Sacrament we ought to have both.* And in his Comment upon the Sixth of *John*, he saith, That *as in the Flesh is received what is vivifying, and restorative of the spiritual and divine Life lost in us, so by the Blood is received the Aspersion, and cleansing of our inward parts.* And making the enquiry, *why, to that manducation Spiritual Drink was necessary to be added,* he answers, it is so, *because Meat cannot be without Drink.* In his Comment

(m) c. 22. f. 321.

on (m) St. *Luke*; *Some,* saith he, *more curious than devout, enquire to what end was the Sacrament of the Blood instituted after the Sacrament of the Body, since the Body of Christ is not without the Blood, nor the Blood without the Body? But to this we say, that though these are as to their nature undivided, yet have they different Effects; for one by Christ is ordained to incorporate, the Blood for the washing away of Sins: whence it is said, That without shedding of Blood there is no Remission: And that which they say that the Body is not without the Blood is true; but yet by virtue of the Sacrament, the Sacramental Body is not in the Blood, nor the Sacramental Blood in the Body: That therefore we might have a Supper Sacramentally perfect, it was necessary that it should be instituted, that the Body and Blood should be Sacramentally had; this therefore is the cause and manner of the Institution; so our King and*

and Priest saves us out of the Flour and out of the Wine-Press.

(n) *Durantus* saith, That *the Church instituted the Sacrament to be taken after the consecration of both Species, to shew, that he who receives the Hoast only, receives not the whole Sacrament Sacramentally: For although the Blood be in the consecrated Hoast, yet is it not Sacramentally there, because the Bread signifies the Body not the Blood, the Wine signifies the Blood, not the Body; wherefore because the Sacrament under one kind is not compleat according to the Sign, the Sacrament ought to be compleat before the Priest use it.* And again, (o) *Although, under the Form of Bread, the Blood may be taken with the Body, and under the Form of Wine, the Body may be taken with the Blood; yet, according to* Innocent *the Third, neither the Blood under the Form of Bread, nor the Body under the Form of Wine is drunk and eaten, because as neither Blood is eaten nor the Body drunk, so neither under the Form of Bread is drunk, or eaten under the Form of Wine.*

(n) Rat. l. 4. c. 54. f. 126.

(o) Ibid. c. 42. f. 106.

Cassander informs us of (p) *Petrus de Palude*, that he asserted, That *the matter of the Sacrament ought to be double*, viz. *the matter of Bread and Drink; because the effect of the Sacrament ought to be perfectly represented by the matter, in a way agreeable to natural things, because the Sacraments effect what they do figure, but the effect of the Sacrament is full Refection of the Soul, and therefore the matter representing this, ought to do it by perfect Refection of the Body, which only is by Meat and Drink.* (q) *Guiliel-mus de monte Laudano*, as he there cites him, adds, That *he who receives the Body, receives the whole Truth, but not the whole Sacrament; and therefore in many places they Communicate with Bread and Wine, that is, with a* whole Sacrament. The (r) Dean of *Lovain*, as he cites him, saith, That *with respect to the Sacrament, and the perfection of it, it is more convenient that the Communion should be made under both kinds, for this is more consonant to the Institution and integrity of it, to corporal Refection, to the Example of Christ, and the Primitive Church.* And again, *He freely confesseth that the Laity communicating under one kind only, receive not a full Sacrament, which consists of two Parts. This Sacrament*, saith (s) *Lyra*, *is given under the double Species of Bread and Wine, that thereby spiritual Refection may perfectly be shewed forth, and because it is a memorial of Christ's Passion, in which the Blood was separated from the Body.* And again, Utrumque est de perfectione hujus Sacramenti, *both Species are of the perfection of this Sacrament*; 1st. *because by both is expressed*

(p) De com. sub utraq; specie, p. 1034.

(q) Lyturg. p. 77.

(r) De commu. sub utraque specie, *ibid.*

(s) In 1 ad Cor. c. xi.

ſed perfectly the Paſſion of Chriſt ſemblably, of which this Sacrament is the memorial. 2dly. *Becauſe both ſignifie nouriſhment perfectly.*

(*t*) In 1 ad Cor. c. xi. *Though the Body and Blood of Chriſt,* ſaith, (*t*) *Carthuſian, are called Sacraments in the plural, yet ſpeaking formally of their perfect and integral Unity, they are but one Sacrament; for they are ordained to one end and compleat act,* viz. *to the ſpiritual Refection of the Soul, in which ſpiritual Meat and ſpiritual Drink is required.*

(*u*) L. 4. de emend. Chriſtianæ Reipub. cap. 19. *The eating,* ſaith (*u*) *Andreas Friſius, is named ſeparately and the drinking ſeparately by his Wiſdom, to which all humane Wiſdom concerning the inſeparability of living Blood from living Fleſh ought to give place; for here we are are not to diſpute from humane reaſon, but to have reſpect to the will of Chriſt, which inſtituted,* convivium non mancum, *not a maimed Banquet, but added drink to the meat.* If any of theſe *Doctors* do elſewhere contradict their own Aſſertions, for that I am not much concerned, it being natural, and almoſt unavoidable, for Men who maintain things contradictory to common reaſon, to ſay one thing when they diſcourſe according to the innate Notions of common reaſon, and another thing when they ſerve the *Hypotheſis* to which they are enſlaved; it ſufficeth me to make theſe plain Inferences from what they have diſcourſed.

§. 5. 1. If both Species are to be delivered to repreſent *Chriſt,* not as *imperfect* but as *perfect Life,* to teach us that there is a *perfect* and *full Refection in this Sacrament,* to ſhew that *Chriſt redeemed the whole Man,* and that *there may be in this Sacrament a repreſentation according to the Inſtitution,* then we who do thus repreſent, thus teach, thus act, according to the Inſtitution muſt be blameleſs, if the Inſtitution hath appointed both theſe Species *to ſignifie one perfect Refection,* they act not ſuitably to their appointment who uſe but one. If *the Bread ſignifies the Body, not the Blood; the Wine the Blood, and not the Body;* and if the Sacrament under one kind be *not compleat according to the Sign,* then, ſeeing every Sacrament is *Sacra rei ſignum,* a *ſign of ſomething ſacred,* this Sacrament can never be compleat, when it is adminiſtered only in one of the appointed ſigns, becauſe a ſacred thing appointed to be ſignified muſt then be wanting: *If whole Chriſt be not under either Species Sacramentally, if the Sacramental Body be not in the Blood, nor the Sacramental Blood in the Body;* if *he who receives the Body only, receive not the whole Sacrament*

crament Sacramentally, then they who adminiſter the Body only, do not adminiſter the whole Sacrament Sacramentally, nor, as is requiſite to the Sacramental Perfection of the Ordinance. If both Species were given *for an entire reparation of the whole Man, to be Food to the Faithful, and to avail to the Safety and Salvation both of Soul and Body*; then muſt they deprive the Laity of their Food, and their entire reparation, and hinder the Safety and Salvation of their Souls and Bodies, who deprive them of one Species: If the Species of Wine is to be received *for the remembrance of that Redemption which was made by the Effuſion of blood, for the memory and repreſentation of Chriſt's Paſſion, that by it we may receive the Aſperſion and cleanſing of our inward Parts*; then muſt they hinder the ſhewing forth of our *Lord*'s Death, and the purification of the Laity, who rob them of the Cup: If by virtue of the Sacrament *we ought to have both Species, to have ſpiritual Meat and ſpiritual Drink*, if the matter of the Sacrament *ought to be double*, and it is neceſſary to a *Supper Sacramentally perfect, that the Body and Blood ſhould both Sacramentally be had*; then they who do not permit the People to have both, do not what they ought. And Laſtly, If this be *more conſonant to the inſtitution, to the integrity of the Sacrament, to the Example of Chriſt, and of the Primitive Church*; ſure they muſt act more conſonantly to the Inſtitution, and the Example of their *Lord*, the Practice of the *Primitive Church*, and the Integrity of the Sacrament, who give both Species, than they who do deprive the *Laity* of one, though, at the ſame time, they do act leſs conſonantly to the *Decrees* and *Conſtitutions* of the *Church* of *Rome*.

CHAP. V.

The Contents.

In opposition to the Council of Constance, *condemning them as Hereticks who pertinaciously assert, That it is Sacrilegious to observe the Law of Communion in one kind; this Practice is declared to be Sacrilegious by* P. Leo, §. 1. *by* P. Gelasius, §. 2. *The Evasions of the* Roman *Catholicks fully refuted.* Ibid. *This is farther proved from the Sayings of the Fathers, compared with the Descriptions which the School-Men give of Sacrilege,* §. 3. *And from the School-Men,* §. 4.

Sess. 13. WHereas the *Council* of *Constance*, approved by the *Church* of *Rome*, declares *it Erroneous to assert, That it is Sacrilegious to observe the Law or Custom of Communicating the Priests that do not consecrate, and the Laity, in one kind only*, and commands that they *who pertinaciously so assert, shall be driven away from the Communion of Christians, as Hereticks, and be grievously punished by the Dioceſans of the place, or their Officials, or the Inquisitors of Heretical pravity*; this mutilation of the Sacrament, hath by the *Doctors* of the *Ancient Church* been adjudged *Sacrilege*, and they who only did receive the Bread, but did not partake of the Cup, have been pronounced *Sacrilegious*, and as such, are commanded to be expelled from the *Society* of *Christians*.

§. 1. Thus *Leo*, ſpeaking of the *Manichees*, ſaith, (*a*) *They avoid the Sacrament of humane Salvation, and believe not that our Lord Christ was truly born, truly ſuffered, was buried, and raiſed again in true Fleſh of our Nature; and when, to conceal their Infidelity, they dare to be preſent at our Myſteries, they ſo behave themſelves in the Communion of the Sacrament, that ſometimes, leaſt they ſhould not poſſibly lie hid, they take Chriſt's Body with their unworthy Mouths, but they wholly decline drinking the Blood of our Redemption,*

(*a*) Cumque ad tegendam infidelitatem ſuam noſtris audent intereſſe Myſteriis, ita in Sacramentorum Communione ſe temperant, ut interdum, quo tutius lateant, ore indigno Chriſti Corpus accipiunt, ſanguinem autem redemptionis noſtræ haurire omnino declinant, quod ideo veſtram volumus ſcire ſanctitatem, ut vobis hujuſmodi homines & his manifeſtentur indiciis, & quorum deprehenſa fuerit ſacrilega ſimulatio, notati, & proditi, a ſanctorum ſocietate ſacerdotali authoritate pelantur. *Serm. 4. in quadrag. c. 5. Ed. Queſnel. p* 217.

demption,

demption, which therefore we make known to your Holiness, that such Men may be known to you by these Tokens, and that, by the Sacerdotal Authority, they may be expelled from the Communion of Saints, whose Sacrilegious Simulation *is thus found out; for blessed* Paul *hath well admonished the Church of God of such Men, saying, We beseech you Brethren, that you mark them who cause Divisions and Offences contrary to the Doctrine which you have received, and avoid them.*

Where evident it is that the Practice of the *Manichees* in Receiving of the Body of the Lord in the *Christian Mysteries*, that so they might dissemble their Infidelity, is called *Simulation*, and their declining to *drink the Blood of our Redemption*, is that which made this *Simulation* to be *Sacrilegious*. 2*dly*. Here it is also evident, that in *St. Leo*'s days, to eat the Body of our Lord, or to receive it, and to drink his Blood, were look'd upon as two distinct things, one of which might be done without the other, the Body being taken when the *Blood of our Redemption was not*, which wholly overthrows the Doctrine of *Concomitance*, on which this *Sacrilege* is founded. 3*ly*. Observe that *Leo* would have such persons expelled from the Communion of Saints for this *Sacrilegious Simulation*. That 4*ly*. He makes the declining of the Cup at any time, a mark sufficient to discern these *Sacrilegious* Persons, and a cause sufficient for their Exclusion from the Communion of *Saints*; whereas had others at any time been permitted in the *Church*-Assemblies to Communicate in Bread alone, for any other Reason, this mark had been no certain indication of a *Manichee* to *Priest* or People, since being caught, they might pretend that they had formerly received the *Cup*, but now abstained for some special cause approved by the *Church*. The *Faithful* therefore must have then generally Communicated at all times, or else the *Manichee* could not be certainly discovered by one *Dry Communion*.

Moreover Pope *Gelasius* did by a Law condemn this half Communion, as a great *Sacrilege*. (*b*) *We have found*, saith §. 2.

(*b*) Non esse sumendum Corpus Domini sine Calice. *Gelasius Majorico & Johanni Episcopis, apud Ivon. decret. part.* 2. *cap.* 8, 9. Comperimus quod quidam in eadem Regione sumpta tantum Corporis Sacri portione, a Calice Sacri cruoris abstineant, qui proculdubio (quoniam *nescio quâ superstitione* docentur obstringi) aut integra *Sacramenta* accipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, *quia divisio unius & ejusdem Mysterii sine grandi Sacrilegio non potest provenire.*

he, *that ſome in the ſame Country having taken only a portion of the Holy Body, abſtain from the Cup of the Holy Blood, who (becauſe I know not by what Superſtition they are ſaid to be bound) ought, without doubt, to receive the entire Myſteries, or to be driven from both; for the diviſion of one and the ſelf ſame Myſtery, cannot happen without* great Sacrilege. Where note, 1. That this Law reſpecteth not *Prieſts* only; for as (c) *Baronius* obſerves, *There is no mention in the Law of the Prieſt Sacrificing*, or of any other of that Order; whence, ſaith he, it is evident that what is generally ſpoken here, ought not to be reſtrained to them. Moreover, *Caſſander* doth aſſure us, That in his *Old Manuſcript*, this was the Title of this *Decree*, That (d) *it was not lawful for any one N. B. to Receive the Communion of the Fleſh, without partaking of the Blood.* In *Ivo* the Title of it runs thus, *That the Body of our Lords is not to be taken without the Cup.* (e) *Micrologus* ſaith, That *P. Gelaſius commanded that they ſhould be Excommunicated*, quicunque, *whoſoever they were, that having taken the Body of our Lord, abſtained from the Cup.* (f) *Radulphus de Rivo* tranſcribes the very words of *Micrologus*, and both of them give the ſame reaſon of this precept, *viz. For as hoin the ſame Decree aſſerts, ſuch a diviſion of the* Sacraments *cannot come to paſs without* great Sacrilege. Now from theſe Teſtimonies it is evident, 1. That from the Tenth to the Fourteenth Century, it was eſteemed an unlawful and *Sacrilegious* thing, for any that were capable of both, to receive the Bread without partaking of the Cup, Yea *Sacrilege* is by them declared to be inſeparable from ſuch a diviſion of this *Myſtery*: It therefore muſt according to the judgment of *Pope Gelaſius*, and of the following Ages who approved of his Decree, be inſeparable from the conſtant practice of the *Church* of *Rome*, ſince the times of the *Council* of *Conſtance*. 2. Whereas the *R. Doctors* ſay this *Decree* was made againſt the *Manichees*, *who held Wine in abomination, and therefore did refuſe the Cup*; and ſo concerns them only who refuſe upon a like account, to drink of it: It is obſervable, that neither *Gelaſius* himſelf, nor any who have ſince that time took notice of this *Law*, have told us that it was peculiarly made

(c) Ad A. D. 496. Sect. 20.

(d) Quod nulli liceat abſque ſanguinis participatione ſolius carnis Communionem percipere. *P.* 19. *p.* 1106.

(e) Excommunicari illos præcipit *quicunque* ſumpto corpore dominico a calicis participatione ſe abſtinerent. Nam (ut ipſe in eodem decreto aſſerit) hujuſmodi Sacramentorum diviſio ſine grandi Sacrilegio provenire non poterit. *Microl. Cap.* 19.

(f) Prop. 23. p. 579.

made againſt the *Manichees*, who abſtained from drinking of the Cup for the formentioned reaſon; but they without Exception declare that by this Law it was not lawful *for any one* to receive the Fleſh without the Cup, and that *whoſoever* did ſo, was by virtue of it to be Excommunicated. And hence (*g*) *Algerus* in the *Twelfth Century* cites this *Decree* to prove that the Bread is ſeparately to be conſecrated into the Fleſh, and the Wine into the Blood of Chriſt, and that both are to be received by the Faithful. And they had reaſon to ſpeak thus generally of it, for that this *Law* of *P. Gelaſius* was not directed againſt the *Manichean Hereſie*, may be made evident from numerous conſiderations: For (1.) had this *Pope* made this Law againſt the *Manichees*, there can be no reaſon imagined why he, as well as *Leo*, ſhould not mention them. 2*ly*. That Expreſſion in the body of this Law, that *he knew not by what Superſtition they were bound up*, cannot fitly be applied to the *Manichees*, for it was, doubtleſs, a matter well known to *Gelaſius*, why the *Manichees* refuſed the Cup, and not unto *Gelaſius* only, but to all the People. For *Leo*, who preceded him, had taken care that not only (*b*) *All the profane and filthy things which were in their Writings, but alſo that the things contained in their ſecret Traditions, ſhould be manifeſted to the Eyes of Chriſtians, that the People might know what they are to avoid, and fly from.* 3*ly*. The very word *Superſtition* ſhews that *Gelaſius* did not intend the *Manichees*; for *ſuperſtition* intimates a deſign of Reverence and Veneration of the Sacrament, although miſplaced, and not well deſigned, whereas the *Manichees* in their refuſal of the Cup, were acted by the groſeſt *Hereſie*; they refuſed Wine as being *unclean*, and *the Gall of the Devil*; and as *P. Leo* ſaith, condemned the Creature, *in Creatoris injuriam, to the reproach of the Creator*. 4*ly*. *Gelaſius* ſpeaks only of thoſe perſons who were then *within the Country of* Squillaci, and in the *Dioceſs* committed by him to *Majoricus* and *John*, whereas it is uncertain whether one *Manichee* was ever there, and is moſt certain they did abound elſewhere. Nor, 5*ly*. can theſe words, *Let them receive the entire Sacraments, or be excluded from them*, be reaſonably applied to the *Manichees*; for none, who know the * Diſcipline of *Ancient* times, can think that

(*g*) L. 2. c. 8.

(*b*) Omnia quæ tam in Scripturis, quam in occultis traditionibus ſuis habent profana vel turpia, ut noſſet populus quid refugeret aut vitaret, oculis Chriſtianæ plebis certa manifeſtatione probavimus. *Decret. Leonis P. c. 6. Collect. à Dionyſio exiguo, apud Fuſtel. p.* 224.

* Vide Concil. Laod. can. 6. & 33.

that the Abettors of so grosse an *Heresie* as that of *Manes*, which held, (*i*) *That there were two first Causes, one Good, the other Evil*; which *denied the Worship of the God of the Old Testament, denied the Resurrection, and the Virgin birth of our dear Lord*, and *worshipped the Sun as God*, could be admitted to the participation of the Holy Sacraments, without a previous condemnation of those prodigious Errors, and a publick Penance; much less that they could be admitted with such freedom by that *Gelasius* who declares, That (*k*) *Christians might not partake of the purity of the Lord's Table with an Heretick; which Table our Ancestors have always abundantly kept severed from all Heretical Pollution*; and who succeeded that *Leo* who compelled the *Manichees*, before they were admitted to the Communion of *Christians, to do publick Penance*; and *by a publick Profession, and Subscription in the Church, to condemn the* Manichean *Heresy*.

(*i*) Aug. ad quod vult Deus, c. 46.

(*k*) Cum nullo prorsus eorum participare debetis, mensæ dominicæ puritatem, quam majores nostri semper ab hæretica magnopere servarunt pollutione discretam. *Caus.* 24. *qu.* 2. *c. nec quisquam.*

Now the Confutation of this pretence, that *Pope Gelasius* made this *Decree* against the *Manichees*, is a full confutation of all that *Romanists* do offer to elude the force of it against them; for then it follows, that this *Decree* cannot reasonably be restrained to them who regarded the species of Wine *as an object of aversion*, or who abstained from the Cup out of *an horrour of Wine*, or *of the Blood of our Lord*: For all these descants evidently do relate unto the Doctrine of the *Manichees*, and therefore they are all confuted by the refutation of that vain pretence, That *P. Gelasius* made this Law against the *Manichees*.

And whereas others tell us, that these were laws then made to restrain the liberty the *Church* before had granted to receive in publick in one kind; this, as it is said without any shadow of proof, so it is fully confuted by the very words of the Decrees of these Two *Popes*. *Leo* objects against the *Manichees*, that by avoiding of the Cup, they declined *the drinking of the Blood of their Redemption*. Now can it be supposed that he knew then of any liberty the *Church* had granted to the Faithful to *decline the drinking the Blood of their Redemption*; that is, of doing the very thing for which he so severely doth condemn the *Manichees*. *Gelasius* decrees touching them of *Squillaci*, That *they shall either take the Sacraments entire, or be entirely driven*

ven from them; plainly inſinuating, that they who received not the Cup, received not an entire Sacrament; and could the Faithful in thoſe times receive the Sacrament ſo, that in the judgment of ſo great a *Pope* it was imperfectly received by them?

Moreover, that this practice muſt in the judgment of the *Holy Fathers* be *Sacrilegious*, will farther be made evident from the comparing of their Sentiments, touching the diſtribution, and receiving of the Cup by all the Faithful, with thoſe deſcriptions which the *School-men* give of *Sacrilege*. For,

1. *Sacrilege*, ſaith (*l*) *Buſenbaum*, *is the violation of a thing holy, that is dedicated to divine Worſhip*; and *to violate what is holy, is* (ſaith (*m*) *Gregorius de Valentiâ*) *nothing elſe, but to do ſomething repugnant to that Worſhip to which a thing is deſigned*: Wherefore if the reception of the Cup by the Laity was deſigned for *their ſhewing forth the Lord's Death*, and the *remembrance of his Paſſion*, it muſt be *Sacrilege* to rob them of it; becauſe *it is the violation of a thing dedicated to Divine Worſhip*, and the doing that which is repugnant to that Worſhip to which the Cup was deſigned. Now the *Fathers* frequently tell us, after St. *Paul*, That we are to eat this Bread, and *drink* this Cup to ſhew forth the Lord's Death. (*n*) *We ought*, ſaith *Baſil*, *to eat the Body, and* drink *the Blood of Chriſt, in remembrance of our Lord's Obedience to the Death*; and this he proves from our Lord's inſtitution, *Luke* xxij. and from St. *Paul*'s rehearſal of it, 1 *Cor.* xi. (*o*) *Becauſe we are delivered by the death of the Lord, being mindful of this thing*, ſaith St. *Ambroſe* we *ſignify it by eating and* drinking *of the things that are offered.* (*p*) *The Communicating of his holy Fleſh, and the Cup of his holy Blood, hath in it a Confeſſion of Chriſt's Death, by the participating of* theſe things *in this world, we commemorate Chriſt's Death*, ſaith *Cyril* of *Alexandria*. *When the Hoaſt is broken*, ſaith (*q*) St. *Auſtin*, *whilſt the Blood is poured out of the Cup into the Mouth of the Faithful, what other thing is ſhewed forth, but the offering of our Lord's Body on the Croſs, and the Effuſion of his Blood out of his Side? Chriſt in this Myſtery,*

(*l*) Medul. Theol. l. 3. Tr. 1. de primo præcepto Dec. c. 2. Dub. 2.

(*m*) In 22. Diſp. 6. q. 15. punct. 1.

(*n*) Δεῖ ἐσθίειν τὸ σῶμα καὶ πίνειν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Κυρίου μέχρι θανάτου ἀγωνίσεως. Moral. c. 3. p. 432.

(*o*) Quoniam morte domini liberati ſumus, hujus rei memores in edendo & potando carnem & ſanguinem quæ pro nobis oblata ſunt ſignificamus. *In* 1 *Cor.* xi. *p.* 170.

(*p*) Glaphyr. l. 2.

(*q*) Apud Grat. diſt. 2. c. de conſecr. Lanfranc. de Sacr. Euch. p. 124.

Myſtery, ſaith *P. Gregory*, *is offered again for us*, (r) *for his Body is there taken, his Fleſh is parcell'd out for the Salvation of the People, his Blood is not given into the hands of Infidels, but poured into the Mouths of the Faithful.* (s) *When we drink out of this Cup*, ſaith *Paſchaſius*, *what do we elſe but declare the Lord's Death? This do*, ſaith (t) *Anſelm*, *that is, drink this Cup in remembrance of me, as oft as you drink it, that you may never drink it without the Memory of my Paſſion, but may have in mind that I ſuffered Death for you. Therefore, ſaith the Apoſtle, our Lord ſaid, This ſhould be done in commemoration of him, for as oft as you ſhall eat this Bread of Life, and ſhall drink this Cup of eternal Salvation, you ſhall ſhew forth, that is, ſhall repreſent, the Death Chriſt ſuffered for us till he comes to Judgment.* (u) *By the Cup thou doſt celebrate the commemoration of our Lord's Death*, ſaith *Theophylact*. (x) *Algerus* in Anſwer to this Queſtion, *Why the Bread is conſecrated into the Fleſh, and the Wine into the Blood apart?* ſaith, *This was done becauſe the Cuſtom prevailed in the Church from Chriſt himſelf, who conſecrated, and gave his Blood, not for diviſion of the Subſtance, but for diſtinction of the Figure, that whilſt the Bread is grinded by the Teeth, it might ſignifie Chriſt's Body broken in his Paſſion; and whilſt the Wine is poured into the Mouth of the Faithful, it might ſignifie Chriſt's Blood ſhed from his Side: Nor is the Body and Blood ſaid to be apart, as if the Body were without the Blood, or the Blood divided from the Body; but it is ſo ſaid in memory of his Paſſion, becauſe in the Sacrament we ought to ſhew forth the Death of Chriſt. When the Bread of the Lord, that is, the Body of the Lord is eaten*, ſaith (y) *Petrus Cluniacenſis*; *when the Cup of the Lord, that is, the Blood of the Lord is drunk, the Death of the Lord is ſhewed forth, that is, it is then repreſented.* (z) *Rupertus*, *that we well know we do in Commemoration of his Death*, viz. *Eat his Fleſh and to drink his Blood.*

(r) Ibi Chriſti Corpus ſumitur ejus caro in populi ſalutem partitur, ejus ſanguis non jam in manus infidelium, ſed in os fidelium funditur. *Dial. l. 4. cap. 58.*

(s) Quem cum bibimus, quid aliud quam mortem domini annunciamus. *De Corp. & ſang. Dom. cap. 21.*

(t) In 1 Cor. xi.

(u) Διὰ τὸ πόσεως φησὶν ἀνάμνησιν τελεῖς τὸ σωτηρικὸν σωμάτος. In 1 Cor. xi. v. 25.

(x) L. 2. cap. 8.

(y) De Sacra. edit. Eraſm. fol. 212.

(z) Comment. in vi. Joh.

And ſurely when two things are equally deſigned, and ſet apart by *Chriſt* for the commemoration of his Paſſion, when they are equally apt, and proper to ſhew forth, and bring to our remembrance the thing they were deſigned to ſignifie, when

when *Christ* and his *Apostles* do command both should be done in prosecution of that end, when the *Fathers* do, with one voice, declare, without the least disparity, distinction or limitation, that both concurr unto that end: And lastly, when one naturally doth import, and shew the breaking of Christ's Body on the Cross; the other doth as naturally signifie, shew forth, and bring to our remembrance his Blood shed, and separated from his Body, and in both these consists the Passion of our *Lord*, to say, our *Saviour*'s Passion is wholly and entirely represented by the Reception of one of the two Species only, is to reflect unworthily upon the Wisdom of our *Lord's Institution* of them both, and his *command* to do both in order to the shewing forth his Death, and evidently to contradict the plain Assertions, and the concurring Judgment of the *Church* of *Christ*, that *by drinking, and receiving into our Mouths this Cup, this Blood, we do, and ought to declare, signifie, represent, commemorate and shew forth Christ's Death.*

Secondly, *Christians*, saith (*a*) *Thomas Aquinas, are sanctified by the Sacraments of Christ, and therefore what is done to the injury of Christian People*, pertinet ad irreverentiam rei sacræ unde rationabiliter Sacrilegium dicitur, *is Sacrilege, because it appertaineth to the irreverence of a sacred thing. To Sacrilege*, saith (*b*) *Becanus, is referred*, omnis injuria, omnisque abusio Sacramentorum, *all injury, and abuse of the Sacraments*; and this is evident even from the drift of the Commandment, *Thou shalt not steal*, for that forbids, in reference to temporal concerns; *omne nocumentum quod homini injustè infertur in rebus exterioribus*; *All hurt done to them in external Things*: In reference to spirituals it therefore must forbid *all spiritual hurt, or injury Men suffer by the detaining of things spiritual from them.* Now surely if *Christians* can be hurt or injured, they must be so when they by others are deprived of the means of Grace and of Sanctification, and spiritual Blessings: Now of these, say the *Fathers*, *Christians* are deprived as oft as they are thus deprived of the Cup of Blessing. For, they constantly affirm, That the eating of the Bread and drinking of the Cup, did tend *to the Sanctification both of Soul and Body.* (*c*) *The Temperature of both the drink and the word*, saith *Clemens* of *Alexandria, is called the Eucharist, of which they who by Faith are made partakers, are sanctified in Body and*

(*a*) L. 2. q. 99. Art. 1.

(*b*) Q. 99. p. 1146.

(*c*) Ἧς οἱ κατὰ πίστιν μεταλάβοντες ἁγιάζονται καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχήν. Pædag. l. 2. c. 2. p. 151.

Soul. In the New Covenant, saith *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *there is the Heavenly Bread, and the Cup of Salvation ſanctifying the Soul and Body.* (d) *Come to the Cup, and receiving of the Blood of Chriſt,* ἁγιάζῃ, *be thou ſanctified. Who can expreſs,* ſaith (e) *Gregory, the greatneſs of that Mercy by which Mankind was redeemed with the Effuſion of Chriſt's precious Blood*; and, *The ſacred Myſtery of his Life-giving Body and Blood, was given to his Members, by which the Church, his Body, is fed and made to drink, is waſhed and ſanctified. The ſuperſubſtantial Bread, and the Cup conſecrated by ſolemn Benediction,* (f) *doth profit to the Life, and the Salvation of the whole Man,* ſaith *Arnoldus Carnotenſis, the Bread is Meat, the Blood is Life, the Bread for fitneſs of Nouriſhment, the Blood for efficacy of giving Life.*

(d) Catech. Myſtag. 5. p. 245.

(e) Et Sacroſanctum vivifici corporis & ſanguinis ſui Myſterium Membris ſuis tribuere, quibus corpus ſuum, quod eſt Eccleſia, paſcitur. *In Pſal.* vi. *pœnit.*

(f) Ad totius hominis vitam ſalutemque proficit. *Apud Cypr. p.* 39, 40.

Moreover this is written with a Sun-Beam in the *Church's Liturgies* in which they call the Cup, received after the Body, (g) πότηριον ζωῆς, *the Cup of Life*; πότηριον σωτηρίας αἰωνίου, *the Cup of everlaſting Salvation.* In which they declare that Chriſt Bleſſing the Cup, (h) καὶ πλήσας πνεύματος ἁγίου, and *filling it with the Holy Ghoſt, ſaid, Drink ye all of this,* and ſaid it was πλήρωμα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, *the fulneſs of the Holy Spirit*; that it was *the Blood of the New Teſtament ſhed for many,* (i) καὶ διαδίδωσιν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, *and diſtributed for the Remiſſion of Sins*; in which they order the *Deacon* when he hath received it, to ſay, *This hath touched my Lips, and will take away mine iniquities, and purge away my Sin*; and in which they laſtly pray, That (k) *they who received it might be filled with all ſpiritual Benediction, and heavenly Grace, and might receive it for Sanctification, and Renovation of Soul, of Spirit, and of Body, for the communication of eternal Life, for the Remiſſion of Sins, that they might be confirmed in Piety, filled with the Holy Ghoſt, made worthy of Chriſt, and obtain everlaſting Life.*

(g) Conſt. Clem. l. 8. c. 13. Lit. S. Petri, p. 26. Lit. Greg. p. 22. Marc. p. 46.

(h) Lit. Chryſoſt. p. 1001.

(i) Lit. St. Marc. p. 47.

(k) Lit. Clem. Petri Marc. Chryſoſt. Baſil. Gregor.

§. 4. This, laſtly, even the *School-men* do confeſs, that it cannot, without immodeſty be doubted, that Chriſtians do receive the increaſe of Grace, by the participation of this Cup. *It is not to be denied,* ſaith (l) *Armachanus, but firmly to be aſſerted, that the Sacramental Sumption of the Body and Blood of our Saviour much profits*

(l) Apud Caſſand. de utraq; ſpecie, p. 1032.

profits the Faithful to the increaſe of Spiritual Life. The (*m*) *Dean* of *Lovain* gives theſe Reaſons why the Communion under both kinds ſhould be more Fruitful, and conferr more Grace; 1. That *there is one effect of Meat, and another of Drink; for Drink allays Thirſt, and Meat Hunger.* 2. That *under both Species the Euchariſt is truly a Sacrament, nor is Chriſt leſs efficacious by his Blood under the Species of Wine, than by his Body under the Species of Bread; nor can the drinking of Chriſt's Blood be unprofitable, if it be lawfully and worthily received.* 3. *Becauſe the Species of Wine is a Sacrament, and all Sacraments, according to the common rule, conferr Grace* ex opere operato. *The draught of Blood hath its proper ſpiritual effect, to allay ſpiritual Thirſt, or to confirm and augment the Grace received in the Communion of the Body. And though Chriſt be under both Species, he operates only according to their ſignification and uſes,* under one the *Body, under the other the Blood as his Inſtrument; and ſince the Sacraments conferr the Grace they ſignifie, when the ſignification is more compleat, the Grace muſt be ſo.* (*n*) *Vaſquez* ſaith thus, *The Opinion of them who ſay more Fruit of Grace is received from both Species of this Sacrament than from one,* probabilior mihi ſemper viſa eſt, *ſeemed always more probable to me; and therefore that they who take the Cup receive an encreaſe of Grace.* And (*o*) *Suarez* informs us, That *it was the Opinion of* many Catholicks, *that more Grace was given by both Species, than by one only, and that Grave Men ſaid, That moſt of the Fathers of the* Trent *Council held that Opinion, and that therefore the Council ſaid warily, That the Faithful, by Communicating under one Species, were not defrauded of any Grace* neceſſary to Salvation. And truly, whoſoever ſaith, That no Grace is received by the due participation of the Cup, doth plainly make our *Saviour's* Inſtitution of it a thing indifferent, and the receiving of the Cup, after the Body, to be the receiving of a thing of no ſpiritual or good effect; which to affirm of the worthy receiving of the ſacred Blood of Chriſt is *horrendum dictu*, and ſomewhat like the *counting of the Blood of the Covenant an unholy thing.*

(*m*) *Ibid.*

(*n*) In 3. D. Thom. diſp. 215. cap. 2.

(*o*) Tom. 3. in 3. D. Thom. diſp. 63. §. 6.

CHAP. VI.

The Contents.

In oppoſition to the Decrees of theſe Councils Damning, and Excommunicating all who ſay, That this Law of Communicating the Laity under one kind is Erroneous and Unlawful. The Fathers have declared that it is Erroneous and Unlawful to ſubſtract the Cup. This is proved from St. Cyprian, *from the complaint of the Preſbyters of* Edeſſa, *againſt* Iba *their Biſhop*, §. 1. *From the Council of* Braga, Paſchaſius, *and* Algerus, §. 2. *In oppoſition to the Council of* Conſtance, *decreeing them to be Excommunicated who exhort the People to Communicate under both ſpecies: The Fathers do exhort all People ſo to do*, §. 3. *Whereas the Councils of* Conſtance *and* Baſil *ſay, That the Cuſtom of Communicating in one kind was obſerved for a long time in the Church, the contrary is plainly ſhewed from Hiſtory*, §. 4.

§. 1. Conſt. Seſſ. 13. Baſil. — 30. Trid. Seſſ. 21. c. 2.

WHereas the *Church* of *Rome* in her *Councils* of *Conſtance*, *Baſil* and *Trent*, declares this practice of miniſtring the Communion in one kind to the fore-mentioned perſons, *is to be received as a Law*, and Damns and *Excommunicates* all thoſe who ſay this Novel Conſtitution of theirs, is either *Erroneous* or *Unlawful*; The *Fathers* have declared expreſly, or by immediate and clear Conſequence, That it is *Erroneous*, *Unlawful*, and of evil conſequence to Religion to ſubſtract the Cup, or one part of the Sacrament from Believers. *If any Man be in that* Error, ſaith (*a*) St. *Cyprian*, (*viz.* That it is not neceſſary to offer and *diſtribute* to the People Wine mixed with Water) *let him return to the Original of our Lord's Tradition*; adding, (*b*) That *to contemn his Admonition, and to perſiſt in his* old Error, *would be to incurr the diſpleaſure of the Lord.* And having ſaid that Chriſt both by his Practice, and his Precept, taught the oblation and *diſtribution* of Wine mixed with Water to the People; he adds, (*c*) *That the whole diſcipline of Religion and Truth is ſubverted, unleſs that which is ſpiritually commanded, be faithfully obſerved.* The *Preſbyters* of *Edeſſa* accuſe *Iba* their *Biſhop* before the *Council* of *Chalcedon*

(*a*) Ep. 63. p. 148.

(*b*) P. 157.

(*c*) Cæterum omnis Religionis & veritatis diſciplina ſubvertitur, niſi id quod ſpiritualiter præcipitur fideliter obſervatur. *P.* 155.

cedon on this wiſe; *That in his Church, whilſt the memory of the Martyrs was Celebrated, there wanted Wine for the Sacrifice of the Altar, to be ſanctified, and diſtributed to the people, there being but little, and that bad and muddy, juſt newly preſſed out of the Grape; ſo that they who were deputed to Miniſter were forced to buy Six Quarts out of the Tavern, which alſo was bad, and not ſufficient; (d) ſo that they called to them who diſtributed the holy Body to deſiſt, becauſe the Blood was wanting.* Whence we learn,

(d) Ὥστε τῆς τὸ ἅγιον σῶμα διανέμουσι ἐνευστάζειν ἐπεκάλουν αὐτὸς ὡς τοῦ αἵματος μὴ ὑπαρχόντος. Concil. Chalced. Tom. 3. Concil. apud Bin. p. 382

1. That though it be now no fault in the *Church* of *Rome* to provide no Conſecrated Blood to be diſtributed to the people, it was then thought Crime ſufficient to accuſe a *Biſhop* of before a *General Council.*

2. That then it was not deemed lawful to Communicate the people under the ſpecies of Bread alone; for if ſo, there would have been no need of running to the *Tavern* to fetch Wine, and much leſs for deſiſting from diſtributing the Conſecrated Bread unto the People, becauſe they had not Conſecrated Wine to miniſter to them afterwards. This ſure muſt manifeſtly ſhew, that it was then eſteemed unlawful to miniſter to the people one ſpecies of the *Euchariſt* without the other.

§. 2.

The *Council* of *Braga* ſaith, (e) *It is a manifeſt* Error *to deliver to the people the Conſecrated Bread* dipped *in the Chalice for a Complement of the Communion, as being not agreeable to the Inſtitution*; and ſurely for the ſame reaſon it muſt be a more manifeſt Error to give them the Conſecrated Bread alone, for a *compleat Communion*; it being more diſſonant from the Inſtitution to give only one part, than to give both only in another manner than was appointed by the Inſtitution. *The Blood is well joined to the Fleſh*, ſaith *Paſchaſius*, *becauſe* (f) *neither the Fleſh without the Blood, nor the Blood without the Fleſh is rightly communicated; for the whole Man, which conſiſts of Two Subſtances is redeemed, and therefore fed together both with Fleſh and Blood.*

(e) Relatus eſt in concione noſtrorum omnium *Error* manifeſtus, quidam enim Euchariſtiam vino madidam pro complemento Communionis credunt populis porrigendam. *Concil. Tom.* 6 *p.* 561.

(f) — Nec caro ſine ſanguine, uti nec ſanguis ſine carne jure communicatur, &c. *Cap.* 19. *Biſ.*

Algerus,

Algerus, in answer to the Question, *Why Bread by it self is Consecrated into the Flesh of Christ, and the Wine into his Blood*, saith, That *therefore the Blood, and Flesh are seen apart in the Sacrament, that because Christ dyed for redeeming our Body by his Body, and our Soul by his Soul, when we had perished both in Body and Soul, it might be signified, that his Body and Soul were in Death divided.* (g) And therefore *Austin* saith, That *neither the Flesh without the Blood, nor the Blood without the Flesh is rightly Communicated.* In a word; this Constitution, thus established for a Law, makes it a Sin to obey and comply with the Institution of our *Lord*, by reason of the Laws of Men; and whether this be not *Erroneous*, let any reasonable person judge from this Consideration:

(g) — Unde ut ait Augustinus, nec caro sine sanguine, nec sanguis sine carne jure communicatur. *De Sacr. Euch. l. 2 c. 8.*

Had our Lord instituted this Sacrament to be Received under the Species of Bread alone, and had he so distributed the same to his Disciples, none, coming after Christ could have thought it lawful to have added Consecrated Wine, and to have distributed it after the Bread: Therefore by parity of Reason, *Christ* having instituted the *Eucharist*, in both the Species of Bread and Wine, and so distributed it, no man can rightly think it fawful to Give the Sacrament in Bread alone to persons capable of both Species. For confirmation of this Argument, let it be considered, that the *Trent Council* declares this power was always in the *Church*, That in the dispensation of the Sacraments, (h) *Salva illorum substantia, ea statueret, vel mutaret; That retaining their substance, she may appoint or change those things which she doth judge expedient for the profit of the Receivers.* If therefore when the Cup was instituted by Christ to be Received, she may change so far the Institution as to make *a Law*, it shall not be received by the *Laity*; if it had not been Instituted, why might she not appoint it should have been received by them?

(h) Sess. 21. c. 2.

§. 3. 3. Whereas the *Church* of *Rome*, by the *Authority* of her *Councils* (i) commands, That they be Excommunicated, *Who*, contrary to her Decree, *Exhort the People to Communicate under both Species of Bread and Wine, and who do take upon them so to administer the Sacrament unto the People*; and doth require, that they be treated as *Hereticks, if they persist without Repentance in so*

(i) Concil. Const. Sess. 13.

so doing. The *Fathers* did not only thus administer the Sacrament in publick, for a thousand Years together, but also did exhort all *Christians* so to do. (k) *After the Communion of the Body of Christ, come to the Cup,* saith *Cyril* of *Jerusalem. The Priest,* saith (l) *Dionysius* the *Areopagite, shewing the Consecrated Gifts, comes himself to partake of them,* καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους προτρέπεται, *and exhorts others so to do.* The Gifts he shewed them were the Bread, and Cup apart, of these he therefore did exhort them to Communicate, after the usual manner; that is, apart. *From taking of the Blood of this Sacrifice,* saith (m) *Austin, not only no Man is restrained, but* All Men are exhorted to drink it, *who will have life.* And again, *They who have not eaten, and have not drunk, let them, being invited, make haste to these Banquets:* (n) *Come to the Flesh of the Lord, come to the Blood of the Lord.* The *Deacon,* saith the *Liturgy* of St. *Chrysostom, bowing, takes the Cup with reverence, and lifting it up he shews it to the People, saying,* (o) μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ καὶ ἀγάπης προσέλθετε, *Come to it with the Fear and Love of God.* In the *Antient Synodal* form of Admonition used in the *West,* we find one Admonition to the (p) *Priest to call upon all the Faithful to come to the participation of the body and the* Blood *of Christ.* Whereas in the Two New Admonitions transcribed by *Baluzius* from the *R. Pontifical,* the injunction is only to invite them *to the Communion of the Body of Christ;* which alteration seems to be occasioned by the change of the Custom of the *Romish Church* in this particular. The *Jews drank of the Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ:* (q) *Drink thou also,* saith the spurious *Ambrose, that Christ may follow thee. The Jews came to Crucify him,* saith *Hincmarus* of *Remes,* (r) *Let us come to him,* ut corpus & sanguinem ejus accipiamus, *That we may receive his Body and Blood.* (s) *Take the Wine pressed out of the Fat of the Cross,* saith *Fulbertus* of *Chartres.* St. *Paul* doth in the like manner say, *Let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup.* And a greater than St. *Paul* saith, *Drink*

ye

(k) Μετὰ τὸ κοινωνῆσαι τε τοῦ σώματος Κριστοῦ προσέρχου καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ. Cat. Myst. 5. p. 245.

(l) Eccles. Hier. c. 3.

(m) Q. 57. in Levit.

(n) Accedite ad carnem domini, accedite ad sanguinem domini. *Serm.* 46. *de verbo dom. cap.* 4.

(o) Tom. 6. p. 1003.

(p) Omnes fideles ad Communionem corporis & sanguinis domini accedere admonete. *Apud Baluz. p.* 605. Ad Communionem corporis domini nostri Jesu Christi invitate. 16. *Not. in Reg. p.* 609, & *p.* 613.

(q) Et tu bibe ut te Christus sequatur. *De Sacr. l.* 5. *cap.* 1.

(r) Tom. 2. p. 94.

(s) Sume vinum de torculari crucis expressum. *De tribus capitib.*

ye all of this (for whom this Blood was shed) *for this is my Blood of the New Testament, shed for many for the Remission of Sins.*

§. 4. Lastly, Whereas the *Councils* of *Constance* and *Basil* to give the better colour to their absurd Decrees, say, That this Custom of Communicating under one kind only, was, *ab Ecclesia diutissimè observata, observed for a long time in the Church*, before they had assembled to make this Custom binding by their *Laws* and *Sanctions*, it is matter of Surprize, that two such great and numerous *Assemblies* should with such confidence assert these things, since, as *Lindanus* saith, (t) *There needs no long demonstration to prove that* both kinds *were administred in the* West *almost till the times of the Council of* Constance.

(t) Quod per occidentem fuerit populo utraque administrata Species in proximum fere usque Constantiensis Synodi Sæculum haud prolixa opus est demonstratione. *Panopl. l. 4. sub finem.*

Was it thus in the Eleventh *Century* in which *Lanfranck* saith, That (u) *the Blood poured out of the Chalice, is taken by the Mouth, and poured into Mouth of the Faithful*? In which *Pope Paschal* made a Decree, That *the Body and Blood of the Lord should be received apart*, and that (x) *this Custom should always be observed in the Church, except in the case of Infants and infirm Persons, not able to swallow down the Bread:* In which (y) *Humbertus* declares, That *in the* Roman *Church the Sacrament was ministred in both kinds apart:* (z) Why then is Cardinal *Bona* so positive in his Assertion, that *always and every where, from the beginning of the Church to the Twelfth Century, the Faithful Communicated under the Species of Bread and Wine?* Was it so in the Twelfth *Century*, when (a) *Algerus* saith, That *both the Body and the Blood were taken by the Faithful, and that neither the Flesh without the Blood, nor the Blood without the Flesh are rightly Communicated?* (b) *Arnoldus Carnotensis*, That *we Christians drink of the Blood by his Command.* (c) *Petrus Cluniacensis*, That *they took the Body and drank the Blood in likeness of Food.* Why then doth (d) *Peter Lombard* put the Question, *Quare sub duplice specie sumitur, why is the Sacrament taken in both kinds?*

(u) Sanguis ejus de Calice fidelium ore potatur. *De Sacr. Euch. f.* 126. a.

(x) Sic semper in Sancta Ecclesia conservandum docemus.

(y) Apud Baron. Tom. 11. p. 971.

(z) Rer. Liturg. l. 2. c. 18. p. 862.

(a) L. 2. c. 8.

(b) Apud Cyp. p. 41.

(c) P. 217.

(d) L. 4. dist. 11. Lit. *f.*

Was

Was it thus in the Thirteenth *Century*, when the (*e*) *Dean* of *Meaux* with his Monks *administred the body and the blood of Christ, to the Souldiers of* Charles *King of* Sicily; when (*f*) *Thomas Aquinas* saith, That *the Sacrament of the Body is delivered to us apart, under the Species of Bread, and the blood under the Species of Wine*; and elsewhere confesseth, That *this custom of Communicating under both kinds, was still observed in some Churches*: When a *Council* held at (*g*) *Lambeth A. D.* 1281. saith, That *only the Celebrators in lesser Churches were permitted to drink the blood under the Species of consecrated Wine*, clearly insinuating, That *in some Churches* all drank of it; when lastly (*h*) *Albertus Magnus* saith, That *under one Species we deliver the Body, under the other the Blood.*

(*e*) Apud Chesn. f. 5. Franc. p. 840.

(*f*) Contra Gentiles *l.* 4. c. 61. Provide in quibusdam Ecclesiis observatur ut populo sumendus sanguis non detur. *In* 3. — *part. qu.* 80. *Ar.* 12.

(*g*) — Solis enim celebrantibus, sanguinem sub specie vini consecrati sumere *in hujusmodi minoribus Ecclesiis est concessum. Concil. Tom.* 11. *Part.* 1. *p.* 1159. (*h*) Sum. de Sacram. Euch. dist 3. Tr. 2. c. 5.

Was it thus in the Fourteenth *Century*, when, saith *Nicolaus* (*i*) *Lyra, the Sacrament is given under the* double *Species of* Bread *and* Wine; when (*k*) *Petrus de Palude*, expressly saith, That *in his Age it was the Custom* in many Churches to communicate under both Species. And (*l*) *Guilielmus de monte Laudano*, That *in many places they communicated with Bread and Wine, that is, with an entire Sacrament.*

(*i*) In 1 Cor. 11. (*k*) Vid. Cassand. de utraq; specie, *p.* 1036. (*l*) Id. Liturg. *p.* 77.

Was it thus in the beginning of the Fifteenth *Century*, that very *Century* in which the *Council* of *Constance* forbad both Species? Why then doth (*m*) *Fervendus Bishop* of *Lucca* say, That *in many Churches or Monasteries, either by Privilege or Custom, not the Conficient only, but others did communicate under both Species?* And why doth *Francis* King of *France* declare, *A. D.* 1535. That (*n*) *in the Memory of his Ancestors the entire Supper was throughout* France *distributed to whosoever would have it, not indeed in the middle of the Temple, but in the Chapels, and that he received this from some Ancient Men, who affirmed that it was not* 120. *Years since the Custom was so in* France. Now take 120 Years from 1535, and there remains 1415, which is the very Year in which the *Council* of *Constance* debarred the *Laity* of the *Cup*. And what is now become of those *many Ages* in which the People Communi-

(*m*) Calixt. de Com. sub utraque specie, *p.* 110.

(*n*) Patrum memoria (dicebat) distributum fuisse per Galliam quibuslibet integram cœnam, non quidem in medio Templo, sed in Sacellis, hoc illum a nonnullis accepisse Grandi ætate, qui ritum istum in Galliis fuisse confirment ante centum & viginti annos. *Skidar. Comment. l.* 9. *p.* 243. *Cassand. de utraque Specie, p.* 1037.

cated not, but in that manner, that is, under one Species only? And what just matter of admiration is it that Men of Learning should with such confidence assert what may so plainly be disproved? And that even *General Councils* should be so little to be credited in what they do so confidently say, and lay as the Foundation of their Definitions and Decrees?

CHAP. VII.

The Contents.

The Doctrine of Concomitance is confuted (1.) *from the words of the Institution*, §. 1. 2dly. *From Reason*, viz. (1.) *Because, according to this Doctrine, the depriving of the Laity of the Cup must be depriving them of whole Christ and all his Benefits*, §. 2. 2dly. *Because Christ's Institution, according to this Doctrine, must be the Institution of a thing directly contrary to the Law of* Moses, §. 3. *Concomitance frees not the Romanist from the Imputation of an half Sacrament, though it doth from the Imputation of giving half Christ*, §. 4. *It is contrary to the received Customs of the* Church *of* Christ, v. g. (1.) *to the Custom of putting a piece of the consecrated Bread into the Cup, and saying,* Fiat commixtio Corporis & sanguinis Domini. 2dly. *To the Custom of mixing the Bread and Wine when they communicated Infants, or persons extreamly sick, and so not able to swallow the Bread dry, that they might truly say, The Body and the Blood of Christ profit thee,* &c. 3dly. *To their constant Custom of speaking of the Body and the Blood of Christ as two Sacraments.* 4ly. *To that distinct effect they attribute unto the several Species.* 5ly. *To their saying that the Body is given under the one, the Blood under the other Species.* 6ly. *To the Decrees of* Leo *and* Gelasius, §. 5. *Mr.* Condom's *vain attempt to prove Concomitance considered, and found to be a farther Evidence, that the Church of Christ for a Thousand Years knew nothing of it*, §. 6.

Concil. Const. Sess. 13. Basil. Sess. 30. Trid. Sess. 43. cap. 3.

MOreover the better to conceal this *Sacrilegious* Defalcation of the Cup, these *Councils* jointly have determined, That *by force of that natural Connexion and Concomitance, which is betwixt the parts of Christ's raised Body, Christ's Body is entire under*

under the Species of Wine, and his Blood under the Species of Bread, it being firmly to be believed, and in no wiſe doubted, that the whole Body and Blood of Chriſt is contained as well under the Species of Bread, as under that of Wine, and not the Fleſh only under the Species of Bread, nor the Blood only under the Species of Wine: This whoſoever ſhall deny, let him be Anathema, ſaith the *Trent Council*; whoſoever *being learned* will not declare upon *Oath* that he believeth, and aſſerts this Doctrine of *Concomitance*, he muſt ſuffer as an (*a*) *Heretick*, ſaith the *Council* of *Conſtance*: And yet this Doctrine which cannot be denied without incurring an *Anathema*, nor disbelieved without the Crime of *Hereſie*, is in it ſelf abſurd, and plainly contrary to *Scripture* and to Reaſon, and that it was unqueſtionably unknown to all the *Ancient Fathers*, and the whole *Church* of *Chriſt*, is very eaſie to demonſtrate.

(*a*) Seſſ. 13. can. 1. Partinaciter dicentes oppoſitum tanquam hæreſin ſunt arcendi & puniendi. Seſſ. 45. apud Bin. Tom. 7. P. 1124.

That this Doctrine is abſurd, that it doth not expound, but rather doth expoſe our *Saviour*'s Inſtitution to the deriſion of Men of Reaſon and Conſideration, will be evident from theſe following Arguments: For,

§. 1. 1. This Novelty apparently deſtroys the energy of the words uſed in the Inſtitution of this Sacred Ordinance, in which our *Lord*, when he had given his Body broken to his own *Diſciples*, and they had actually received it, ſaith of the following Cup, *Drink ye all of this, for this is the blood of the New-Teſtament ſhed for you.* Whereas if he knew any thing of this *Concomitance*, he muſt know alſo they had received this *blood of the New-Teſtament* already, and therefore might have ſpared his Cup and Reaſon both. *This do as oft as you drink it* came too late, for they had done what he commanded, in effect, before he bid them do it. *Tantundem ſub alterutrâ ſpecie atque ſub utraque continetur, as much is contained under either Species as under both*, ſaith the *Trent Council*, *i. e.* whole and entire Chriſt, his Body, Blood, his Soul, and his Divinity, and ſo as much as is delivered in, and as much Grace conveighed by the Reception of one Species as both. For, I ſuppoſe, that by participation of *Chriſt* in this entire manner, we have entirely the Grace of the Sacrament. Why therefore did our *Lord* inſtitute the other Species ſo perfectly unneceſſary to con-

Matth. xxvi. 27, 28.

Seſſ. 13. c. 3.

veigh any thing of *Christ*, or of his Grace unto us? Why did he bleſs the Cup, and bleſſing ſaid, with like Solemnity, and with expreſs injunction, Drink ye all of this? Or why did he permit his *Church* for a whole Thouſand Years to give his Members, a thing which might be oft of a pernicious influence to them who did receive it unworthily, but could be of no ſpiritual advantage to them who did receive it worthily; ſince after we have taken worthily the conſecrated Body, we have taken as much as when we have received the Blood alſo?

Treat. of Communion in both Kinds, p. 327. Mr. *Condom* ſets down this as their Principle, *That he who hath received the Bread of Life*, has no need of receiving the ſacred Blood, *ſeeing he has received, together with the Bread of Life, the whole Subſtance of the Sacrament, and together with that Subſtance, the whole eſſential virtue of the Euchariſt.* Now from this Principle it follows with the cleareſt evidence, that it was needleſs for our *Saviour* to have ſaid to his *Diſciples*, after they had received the Bread of Life, *Drink ye all of this* Cup. That his Inſtitution of the Cup to be received after the Bread of Life, was a *needleſs Inſtitution*, that the *Church* was imployed in a *needleſs* Action for a Thouſand Years, when ſhe diſtributed the Cup to all Believers. That when our *Saviour* ſaid, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New-Teſtament which is ſhed for many for the Remiſſion of Sins*, he gave a *needleſs* reaſon of a *needleſs* Action, exhorting them to do what they had wholly done already, to the end here aſſigned by him of the drinking of it. And can that Principle be true which caſts ſuch horrid Imputations on the Commands, the Inſtitution, and the Reaſon of that Inſtitution aſſigned by our *Bleſſed Lord*, and on the conſtant Practice of the whole *Church* of *Chriſt*.

And indeed this new *Capricio* of *Concomitance* cannot well be thought of by a *Roman Doctor*, but preſently this Queſtion ſtares him in the Face, *To what purpoſe then was the Inſtitution of both Species?* they being conſcious to themſelves that the very natural, and obvious Concluſion from it would be this, That our Lord's Inſtitution of both Species was to no purpoſe; they therefore have invented a new Reaſon of the neceſſity of Conſecrating both the Species apart, *viz.* That *the Separation once made upon the Croſs of our Lord's Body and Blood, might never ceaſe* to appear on the Holy Table. Now is it not wonderful, that *Chriſt* ſhould ſtabliſh a continual repreſentation

Mr. Condom, *ibid.* p. 179, 180.

of

of the ſeparation of his Blood from his Body by Species, which he commands us to believe, contain his Body and his Blood united. What a pretty Myſtery do theſe Men make of the ſacred Inſtitution of our *Lord*. Bread and Wine never ceaſe to appear unto our Senſes, and yet we muſt not believe this Appearance, but by Faith believe there is no ſuch thing; the ſame Faith teacheth me, that our *Lord*'s Body and Blood are united there, and yet I muſt believe our *Lord* deſigned the continual repreſentation of them there as ſeparate, where Faith informs me there is no ſuch thing.

Secondly, This Doctrine of Concomitance ſeems even to ridicule our *Saviour*'s words, and make them run to this effect; I ſay unto you, *This is my Body broken*, not by way of repreſentation only, but ſubſtantially ſo; and yet I know my Body neither is ſubſtantially broken in this Sacrament, nor can it ever be ſo. I bid you take this Cup, and to encourage you to do ſo, I ſay, *This is my Blood ſhed*, or ſeparated from my Body, and yet I know that there is always in this Sacrament ſuch a *Concomitance*, as renders it impoſſible my Blood ſhould be thus ſeparated as I ſay it is. But notwithſtanding I inſtitute a Myſtery, which by ſome broken Accidents of Bread annihilated, or ſome few colours or bare Species of Wine, without a ſubject, ſhall give ſome faint reſemblance of my Body broken, and my Blood ſhed for you: This is my broken Body; that is, under theſe broken Accidents of Bread lyeth my Body whole, and united to my Blood, and therefore not my Body broken for you. This is my Blood, ſhed for you; that is, under this empty ſhew of Wine lieth my Blood united to my Body, and ſo my Blood not ſhed; and whether *hoc eſt corpus*, thus interpreted, doth not make Nonſence of the words, let the conſiderate Reader judge.

Thirdly, If there be ſuch a neceſſary Concomitance in the Sacrament, then muſt each part of the Sacrament exhibit whole and entire *Chriſt*, with all his Benefits, and conſequently the depriving the *Laity* of one part, or Species of the Sacrament, muſt be the depriving them of whole *Chriſt*, and all his benefits. Now then in doing this, either they are deprived of ſome ſpiritual Benefit, or not; if the firſt, then muſt the *Romaniſts be Sacrilegious*, becauſe they do deprive the people §. 2.

ple of ſome ſpiritual Benefit from thoſe ſacred Myſteries they formerly received, and that agreeably unto the Inſtitution of our *Lord*, and the common practice of the *Church* for a Thouſand Years. If the receiving of the *Chalice* worthily be of any advantage to Souls, then he, who does not receive it, is a looſer; and he by whom they are deprived of this ſpiritual Good muſt be a *Sacrilegious* perſon. If it be ſaid that no ſpiritual Benefit can accrue to them by drinking of the Cup, then muſt it be aſſerted that albeit a Man receive entire *Chriſt* worthily, yet may he never be the better for it, and what is this but to *eſteem the Blood of the Covenant* thus received *an unholy thing*.

§. 3. *Fourthly*, had our *Lord* taught Concomitance, his Inſtitution of this Sacrament had been the Inſtitution of a thing directly contrary to the Law of *Moſes*, *viz. The eating of Fleſh with the Blood*, and then it muſt have miniſtred offence to the *Apoſtles*, and the firſt *Jewiſh Converts*, who were all ſtrict obſervers of that Law. Since then we do not find that the *Apoſtles*, the *Jewiſh Converts*, or even the *Sects* of *Nazeranes* and *Ebionites* did ever ſcruple the receiving of the Sacrament on this account, we may preſume our *Saviour* taught no ſuch *Concomitance*.

§. 4. To conclude, ſhould we admit of this imagination, it would not free the *Romaniſts* from the Imputation of an half Sacrament, though it would from delivering of half Chriſt. For ſeeing a Sacrament is *an outward viſible ſign*, it follows evidently, he who hath but half of the outward viſible ſigns, hath but half of the Sacrament, and conſequently an half Sacrament. He that receives only the Bread, receives only the Sacrament of the Body, and not the Sacrament of the Blood of *Chriſt*, and ſo receives not an entire Sacrament.

§. 5. That the *Fathers* of the *Church* till the Tenth Century knew and believed nothing of this Doctrine of *Concomitance*, as it is evident from many of their Teſtimonies cited in this Diſcourſe, ſo may it fully be evinced from the received Cuſtoms of the *Church* of *Chriſt*.

And, *Firſt*, this may be proved from that received Cuſtom mentioned in all the *Liturgies*, both of the *Eaſtern* and the *Weſtern*

Weſtern Churches, which was to bite or break a piece of the conſecrated Bread, and putting it into the Cup, to ſay theſe words, (*b*) *Let there be made a mixture, and a conſecration of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* For though (*c*) *Durantus* and (*d*) *Bona* do, in conformity to the New Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, carefully remark that the *Prieſt doth not thus ſpeak as if thoſe things were then united, which before were ſeparated*, and that they made no mixture of our *Lord's* Body and his Blood, according *to their real eſſences*, but only *according to their Sacramental Species*, yet do the *Liturgies* refuſe this Subterfuge, and their *Expoſitors* ſufficiently confute this uncouth *Gloſs*, for they do never ſpeak of a Commixtion of the *Sacramental Species*, but always of *the Body and Blood of Chriſt*. They pray that *this Commixtion and Conſecration may avail to their* (*e*) *eternal Salvation*, which cannot be expected from the *Sacramental Species*, but only from the real Body and the Blood. *Albinus Flaccus* doth inform us, That this Commixtion is made (*f*) *that the Cup of the Lord may contain the whole fulneſs of the Sacrament, as it were by the Copulation of the ſame Myſtery. This is not done in vain*, ſaith (*g*) *Amalarius, for corporal Life conſiſts of Fleſh and Blood, whilſt theſe two continue in Man his Spirit or Life continues. In that Office is ſhewn that the blood ſhed for our Souls, and the fleſh dead for our Body, return to their proper Subſtance, and that the New Man* (Chriſt) *is made lively by the quickening Spirit; that he who died for us, and roſe again, can die no more.* (*h*) *Rabanus Maurus* in like manner ſaith, That *the particle conſecrated, thus put into the Chalice, ſhews that the Body of Chriſt is now riſen from the Dead.* (*i*) *Micrologus* ſaith, That *this mixture is made to ſignifie the Conjunction of the Soul and Body of Chriſt in the Reſurrection*, and that *the particle put into the Chalice ſignifies the Body of our Lord riſen from the dead.* Now they who ſay this mixture was made that the Cup might contain the *fulneſs of the Sacrament*, did not believe that the Cup before contained the Sacrament compleatly, as it muſt do, if it contained the Body before. And they who ſay, That this

(*b*) Fiat commixtio & conſecratio corporis & Sanguinis Domini noſtri. *Ordo Rom. apud Caſſandr. p.* 112, 119.

(*c*) Durant. de rit. Eccl. l. 2. c. 52.

(*d*) Bona rerum Liturg. l. 2. c. 16. p. 814.

(*e*) In vitam æternam. *Ord. Rom.*

(*f*) Ut calix Domini totam plenitudinem contineat Sacramenti. *Cap. de celebr. Miſſ. p.* 93.

(*g*) De Eccleſ. Offic. l. 3. c. 3.

(*h*) Per particulam oblatæ immiſſæ in calicem oſtendit Chriſti corpus quod jam reſurrexit a mortuis. *De inſt. Cleric c. ult.*

(*i*) Ad deſignandam corporis & animæ conjunctionem, in reſurrectione Chriſti. *cap.* 17.

this is done to ſhew *that the Body of Chriſt is now alive*, and *riſen from the dead*, and that this mixture therefore ſheweth this, becauſe it joineth, or uniteth Fleſh and Blood, did not believe they were before united by *Concomitance*. And as our *Lord* by conſecrating the Wine, after he had diſtributed the Bread, and bidding them all drink thereof, becauſe it was the *Blood of the New Teſtament*, declared ſufficiently, that he did not conceive that his *Diſciples* had received already that ſame Blood he Conſecrated that they might receive it. Even ſo theſe *Chriſtians*, who mixed the Conſecrated particle of our *Lord's* Body with his Blood, that ſo the Union of both, in which our *Saviour's* Life conſiſted, might be repreſented, ſufficiently declare, they did not think his Fleſh and Blood were by *Concomitance* before united.

Secondly, This will be farther evident from that known Cuſtom of the *Church* which was to mix the Bread and Wine, that ſo when they Communicated *Infants*, or infirm perſons who could not ſwallow down the Bread alone, they might truly ſay, *The Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, profit thee to Life Eternal*; for that this Decree of the *Council* of *Tours*, That *the Sacred Oblation* given to ſuch perſons *ſhould be dipped in the Blood of Chriſt, that ſo the Prieſt*, who gave it to them, *might truly ſay to the infirm Perſon, The Body and Blood of Chriſt profit thee*, &c. was obſerved in the *Church* from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century, we learn from (*k*) *Regino*, *Ivo* and *Burchardus*, who all make mention of this *Canon*, as a Law which was obſerved in their times. That this practice was uſed though not with Approbation, in the Fourth *Century*, even in the Adminiſtration of this Sacrament in publick, is evident from the Condemnation of it, by (*l*) *P. Julius*, *A. D.* 336. in theſe words, *We have heard that ſome, poſſeſſed with a Schiſmatical Ambition, do deliver to the people the Euchariſt dip'd for a compleat Communion; which thing, how contrary it is to the Evangelical and Apoſtolical Doctrine, and how repugnant to the Cuſtom of the Church, it is not hard to prove, from the Fountain of Truth, from whom proceeded the appointment of the Myſteries of the Sacrament. For this they have not received from the Goſpel, where Chriſt commended his Body and his Blood*

(*k*) Quæ ſacra oblatio intincta debet eſſe in ſanguine Chriſti ut veraciter poſſit Presbyter dicere infirmo, corpus & ſanguis domini proficiat tibi, &c. *Regino de Eccleſ. Diſcipl. l.* 1. *cap.* 70. Proficiat tibi in remiſſionem peccatorum & vitam æternam, *Ivo Decret. part.* 2. *cap.* 19. *Burch. l.* 5. *c.* 9.

(*l*) Concil. Tom. 2. p. 528.

blood to his Diſciples, for there the commendation of the Bread apart, and of the Cup apart, is rehearſed; nor do we read, that Chriſt gave Bread dipp'd to any but to that Diſciple whom he would ſhew to be the betrayer of his Maſter by the ſop dip'd. This, ſaith (*m*) *Micrologus*, is the prohibition of *Julius*, *the Thirty fourth Pope*, *writing to the Biſhops of* Egpyt. (*m*) Cap. 19.

Thirdly, This will be farther evident from this Conſideration, That the *Fathers* do certainly ſpeak of the Conſecrated Bread and Wine, as of Two Sacraments; and that as really diſtinct as are the Sacraments of *Baptiſm* and *Chriſm*. This we may learn from all thoſe numerous paſſages in which they are ſtill ſtiled by the *Fathers* of the *Weſtern Church*, Sacramenta, Myſteria, Sacramenta Cœleſtia, divina Myſteria: *The Sacraments*, and *Myſteries* (in the Plural), *the heavenly Sacraments*, and *divine Myſteries*: and by the *Eaſtern Fathers*, ἅγια δῶρα, θεῖα μυστήρια, φρικτὰ μυστήρια, ἁγιάσματα: *The Holy Gifts*, *the divine Myſteries*, *the Holy Sacraments*, &c. Thus do the *Greeks* ſpeak of them to this very day; thus did the celebrated Writers of the *Weſt* ſpeak and write of them till the *Eleventh Century*, when *Tranſubſtantiation* began to be eſtabliſhed, and with it the Doctrine of *Concomitance*. *The Sacraments*, ſaith (*n*) *Iſidore Hiſpalenſis*, *are Baptiſm and Chriſm*, *the Body and the Blood of Chriſt*, *which are therefore called Sacraments*, *becauſe under the veil of Corporeal things*, *the divine Virtue doth more ſecretly work the Salvation of thoſe Sacraments*. Which words are borrowed from *Pope Gregory*, and are repeated by *Paſchaſius*, only with this addition, *Theſe are the Sacraments of the Church of Chriſt*. *Rabanus Maurus* hath the ſame words; and having diſcourſed of *Baptiſm* and *Chriſm*, he proceeds thus, *Becauſe we above diſcourſed, as much as God enabled us, of Two Sacraments, Baptiſm and Chriſm*, (*o*) ſupereſt ut de reliquis duobus, id eſt, Corpore & Sanguine Domini diligentius inveſtigemus, *It remains that we diſcourſe of the Two other Sacraments*, viz. *The Body and the Blood of Chriſt*. Whence firſt we learn that then the Sacraments were not accounted Seven, as they are now at *Rome*; but only Four, or rather Two, *Chriſm* being held as one with *Baptiſm*, and the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* being, as to the Species in which it was to be celebrated, double; which Species were therefore called *Sacraments* by *Gregory*,

(*n*) Sunt autem Sacramenta Baptiſmum & chriſma, corpus & ſanguis. *Orig. l. 6. c. 19. Raban. M. de Inſt. Cler. l. 1. c. 24. Paſch. cap. 9.*

(*o*) De Inſt. Cler. l. 1. c. 31.

(p) In 4. Sent. dist. 12. Art. 2. q. 2.

faith (p) *Bonaventure*, yet are they but one *Sacrament* by virtue of the Institution, and end for which both are design'd, *viz. The Union of the body Mystical.* Now they who do so often speak of both these Species as *Sacraments*, the *Sacraments of the Church*, and as *Two Sacraments*, because they have their distinct operations towards the health or the Salvation of those who worthily Receive them, and both conduced to the Union of the *Mystical Body* of the *Lord*, could not imagine, that by virtue of that *Concomitance*, of which they never speak one word or syllable, the virtue of both Species was contained in, and was intirely conveighed by one alone. For they must be supposed to hold the Cup a *Sacrament* of our *Lord*'s Institution, and therefore not superfluous; that it was *Sacra rei Signum: a Sign of a thing Sacred*, which did conveigh the Grace it signified, and operated to the Salvation of those who worthily Received it, after they had received the Body, and which conduced unto the Union of the Body *Mystical*, to their head *Christ Jesus*. They lastly must conceive, that to deprive Christ's Members of the Cup, was to deprive them of one Sacrament.

And, *Fourthly*, this appears from those sayings of the *Fathers* which attribute a distinct effect unto the several Species; (q) *The Flesh of Christ was delivered*, faith St. *Ambrose*, *for the Salvation of the Body; and the Blood was poured out for our Souls*, &c. (r) *Haymo* and *Anselm* use the same words with a little variation; saying, That *we receive the Sacraments for safety of the Body and Soul; for the Flesh was offered for the Salvation of the Body, and the Blood shed for our Souls, that both our substances might receive the inheritance of Eternal Life.* (s) *Peter Lombard*, (t) *Ivo Carnotensis*, (u) *Hugo de Sancto Victore*, and (x) *Alexander* of *Hales* cite the very words of *Ambrose*, to prove the same thing.

(q) Caro salvatoris pro salute corporis, sanguis vero pro anima nostra effusus est. *In* 1 *Cor.* xi. *p.* 270.

(r) Haym. in 1 Cor. xi. p. 129. Anselm. ibid.

(s) L. 4. dist. 11. Quare sub duplici specie.

(t) Decret. p. 2. c. 7.

(u) Tom. 5. c. 6.

(x) Sum. Theol. part 3. num. 29. Art. 9.

And, *Fifthly*, This will be farther evident from those *Fathers* who assert, That the Body is given under the one, the Blood under the other Species: This *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* informs those whom he Catechised, That (y) *in the Species of Bread is given the Body of Christ, and in the Species of Wine his Blood.*

(y) Catech. Myst. 4. p. 237.

Blood. The (z) *Liturgies* do in like manner pray, That *God would make this Bread the precious body of Christ, and that which is in the Cup the precious blood of Christ.* (a) *Lanfrank* informs us, That *sumitur quidem caro per se, & sanguis per se, The Flesh is taken by it self, and the Blood by it self, the Flesh under the form of Bread, and the Blood under the form of Wine.* They therefore seem not even in his days to have been acquainted with the new Doctrine of *Concomitance.*

(z) Lit. Chrysost. Tom. 6. p. 998.
(a) F. 11, 12.

Sixthly, This is apparent from the *Decrees* of *Leo* and *Gelasius* concerning those who in their time abstained from the Cup. For of the *Manichees* (b) *P. Leo* saith, That they indeed received the Body of Christ, but *they declined, haurire sanguinem Redemptionis nostræ, to drink the Blood of our Redemption*; he therefore thought that they could not drink the Blood, according to our *Saviour*'s Institution, who received not the Cup. (c) *Gelasius* saith, That the declining of the Cup was *the dividing of one and the same Mystery*, which could not truly be affirmed, if by taking of the Bread alone an entire Sacrament, and whole *Christ*, Body and Blood were taken and received. He also adds, *Let them either take the whole Sacrament, or be driven from the whole*, clearly intimating, that by receiving the Bread only they received not the whole.

(b) Serm. 4. in quadrages. cap. 5.
(c) Apud Ivon. decr. part. 2. cap. 89.

But it is needless to proceed in confutation of this vain imagination, for had it ever entered into the Heads of the Renowned *Fathers* of the *Church*, they would not so unanimously have said, the Cup was necessary to be received *for the remembrance of our Lord's Death and Passion, for the procuring of our union to Christ, for the Remission of Sins, for the increase of Grace, for the Sanctification and Salvation both of Soul and Body*; they would not have concluded the Sacrament was imperfect when it was not received; nor would they with such Passion have exhorted those who had received the Body *to come and be partakers of the Cup*; or stiled it, as in their *Liturgies* they always do, *the Cup of Life, Redemption* and *Salvation*, as we have seen they did.

Mr. *Condom* nevertheless thus Triumphs over us; *Gentlemen open your own Books, open* Aubertine, *the most learned Defender of your Doctrine, you will find there, in almost every Page, passages taken from St.* Ambrose, *St.* Chrysostom, *the two* Cyrils, *and from many others, where you may read, That in receiving the sacred Body*

§. 6. P. 356.

of our Lord, they received his Perſon it ſelf; ſeeing they received, ſay they, the King in their Hands, they receive Jeſus Chriſt, and the Word of God; they received his Fleſh as living, not as the Fleſh of a meer Man, but as the Fleſh of God; is not this to receive the Divinity together with the Humanity of the Son of God? and, in a word, his entire Perſon; after this what would you call Concomitancy?

Anſw. What is all this to the purpoſe? Is this the manner of ſpeaking uſed by the *Romaniſts* ſince the New Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* was invented, and ſince the *Sacrilegious* Defalcation of the Cup? Do they expreſs *Concomitance* by ſaying, *You receive Jeſus Chriſt, the King, the Word of God, the living Fleſh of God?* Is it not this they carefully and frequently inculcate, that *under that one Species alone*, which is diſtributed to them, they receive *Jeſus Chriſt whole and entire?* Doth not the *Council* of *Conſtance* thus expreſs it, That (*d*) *it is firmly to be believed, and no way to be doubted, that the whole Body and Blood is truly contained both under the Species of Bread, and likewiſe under the Species of Wine?* Doth not the (*e*) *Trent Council* ſay, That *by virtue of this Concomitance, the Body is under the Species of Wine, and the Blood under the Species of Bread, Anathematizing* them who teach the contrary; and that *under one Species is contained a true Sacrament?* Are not the *Romaniſts* ſtill endeavouring to poſſeſs the People with theſe Sentiments, That *in receiving one Species alone they looſe nothing*, ſince by *Concomitancy* they receive both the Body and the Blood? Is it not this which the (*f*) *Trent Council* is ſo concerned to teach, that *as much is contained under either Species as under both?* Let therefore *Mr. Condom*, if he believes the *Fathers* held Concomitancy, ſhew out of all their Writings any thing of this Nature, which may convince us that they did aſſert it, or let him reſt aſſured, that what the *Romaniſts*, ſince the Twelfth Century (*g*) have been continually inculcating, and obtruding upon others, what filleth all their Books, and their Diſcourſes on this Subject, but never was once mentioned by any *Chriſtian* Writer for a Thouſand Years, though they were equally concerned, and had all the ſame reaſon, if they believed *Concomitancy*; yea, and the ſame occaſion, if they had generally practiſed the *half Communion*; ſo to do, is but a Novelty invented by the *Roniſh Doctors* only to ſerve a cauſe, and

(*d*) Seſſ. 13. vide Baſil. Seſſ. 30. *Concil. Tom.* 12. *p.* 601.

(*e*) Seſſ. 13. cap. 3. & can. 1

(*f*) Seſſ. 13. cap. 3.

(*g*) Attendant inſuper Sacerdotes quod cum Communionem ſacram porrigant ſimplicibus, ſollicite eos inſtruant ſub panis ſpecie ſimul eis dari corpus & ſanguinem Domini. —*Concil. Lambeth. A.D.* 1281. *Concil. Tom.* 11. *part.* 1. *p.* 1159.

and juſtifie the *Defalcation* of the Cup. When the *Doctors* of that Church would in their *ſuppoſititious Treatiſes* make the Ancients ſpeak in this new *Dialect*, they do not mince the matter thus, but make them ſpeak exactly in their *Roman Language*. Thus in that *Epiſtle* falſly ſaid to be writ by *Iſidore Hiſpalenſis* to *Redemptus*, they introduce him ſpeaking thus, (*b*) *When the conſecration of the Elements is made, there is under the Species of Bread not the Fleſh of Chriſt only, and in the Chalice not his Blood only, as ſome unskilful perſons think, but in both there is God and Man, whole and entire Chriſt in his Glorified Body, whole Chriſt in the Cup, the living Bread who came down from Heaven is entire and whole in both.* Here is plain dealing, only the *Language* and other unqueſtionable Circumſtances, as (*i*) *Aubertine* well notes, demonſtrate, that the *Author* could not write before the middle of the Eleventh *Century*, becauſe the Controverſie betwixt the *Greeks* and *Latins* touching *unleavened Bread*, which gave occaſion to that Diſcourſe, began not till the year 1053.

(*b*) Cum prædictorum fuerit conſecratio, non, ut quidam putant indocti, ſub panis ſpecie, ſola caro Chriſti, & in Calice tantummodo ſumitur ſanguis, ſed in utroq; Deus & homo in corpore glorificato totus & integer Chriſtus, integer Chriſtus in calice, panis vivus qui de cœlo deſcendit totus eſt in utroq;. *Epiſt. Iſidori ad Redemptum, p.* 696.

(*i*) De Euchariſt. p. 902.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

CHAP. VIII.

The Contents.

The Assertions of J. L. *touching Communion in one kind*, §. 1. *Against whom it is proved*, (1.) *That Christ's Institution of the Sacrament is virtually a Command, obliging all the Faithful, as much as in them lieth to receive both kinds, which is proved by Three Reasons*, §. 2. 2dly. *That it appears not from the words of our Saviour*, Joh. vi. *that Christ left that Practice indifferent; where by many Arguments it is proved, That nothing in that Chapter relates to the Sacramental eating of the Eucharist*, §. 3. 3dly. *That this appears not from the Practice of our Lord or his Disciples*, §. 4. 4ly. *That it was the Custom of the Church for a Thousand Years to give the Sacrament to the Sick in both kinds*, §. 5. *And in like manner to Infants capable of receiving both*, §. 6. 5ly. *That neither* Leo *nor* Gelasius *gave any precept to the Church touching this matter*, §. 7.

§. 1. BY way of *Appendix* to this Treatise, I shall consider what the *Author* of *a Papist misrepresented and represented* hath discoursed upon this Subject, *Chap.* 21. where he asserts, "That *the Papist truly represented*, believes, That he is obliged "to obey all the Commands of Christ, and that neither his "*Church*, nor any other Power upon Earth can limit, alter or "anull any precept of Divine Institution, contrary to the in- "tention of the Law-giver. Neither is the denial of the Cup "to the Laity a practice any way opposite to this his Belief; "he being taught, that though *Christ* Instituted the blessed "Sacrament under both kinds, and so delivered it to his *Apo-* "*stles*, who only were then present, and whom he had made

Priests

" *Prieſts* juſt before; yet he gave no command, that it ſhould " be ſo received by all the Faithful, but left this indifferent; " as is evident from his own Words, where he attributes " the obtaining Life everlaſting, (the end of the Inſtitution) " ſometimes to the receiving under both kinds, ſometimes un- " der one; as when he ſays, *If any Man eat of this Bread, he " ſhall live for ever. He that eateth me, even he ſhall live by me. " He that eateth of this Bread ſhall live for ever*, (Joh. vi. 51, 57, 58.) " And a curious *Reader* may find as many Texts for thus " receiving under one kind, as for the other. And St. *Augu- " ſtin* who was ſo far of this Opinion, that he ſays, That " Chriſt himſelf adminiſtred the Sacrament to ſome of his Diſ- " ciples under one kind only, *viz.* to thoſe two going to *Emaus*, (*Luc. c. laſt.* 30.) " and that the *Apoſtles* afterwards did of- " ten practiſe the like, when they aſſembled to break Bread, (*Acts* ii. *&c.*) " which place he and many other *Fathers* ex- " plicate of the Sacrament, (*Aug. l.* 49. *de Conſ. Evang.*) " And this was the Cuſtom of the *Primitive Chriſtians*, to give it " under one kind to *Children*, the *Sick* uſed ſo to carry it with " them, is atteſted by all ancient Writers, and modern *Hi- " ſtorians*. Nay he finds that this was the practice of the " Church, to communicate under one kind only, or elſe under " both, as every one thought good, eſpecially in all *Private* " *Communions*, for the firſt Four hundred years after *Chriſt*; " and that the firſt precept of receiving under both kinds was " given to the Faithful by *Pope Leo* I. in the Year 443, and " confirmed by *Pope Gelaſius* in 490. Not for correcting any " Abuſe that had crept into the *Church*, but for the diſcover- " ing the *Maniches*, who being of Opinion that *Chriſt* had no " true Blood, and that Wine was *the Gall of the Devil*, uſed to " lurk among the *Chriſtians*, and receiving under the form of " Bread only, as the reſt did, remained undiſtinguiſhed, till " by this obligation of all receiving the Cup (which they " judged unlawful and abominable) " they were all detected. " And now, if a thing till that time indifferent, was for theſe " motives determined by an Eccleſiaſtical Precept, and ſo ob- " ſerved for many hundred Years, without ſcrupling or que- " ſtioning the Authority; why ſhould he doubt to ſubmit to " the ſame Authority, when upon different motives and cir- " cumſtances, they iſſue forth another Precept? Which *Ha- " rangue* contains theſe two Aſſertions. 1. *That*

I. *That Christ gave no Command that the Sacrament of the Eucharist should be received in both kinds by the Faithful.*

II. *That he left this indifferent*; and that this appears,

1. From his own words, *Joh.* vi.

2. From his own practice, and from the practice of his own *Disciples* administring the Sacrament to the Faithful in Bread alone.

3. From the Custom of the *Primitive Church*, who gave it to the Sick, to Infants, to Men in a Journey to carry with them, in one kind only.

4. Because it was a thing indifferently practised, even in the *Church* till *Leo* the First, in the Year 443, upon occasion of the *Manichees*; and for Conviction of them, commanded the Receiving in both kinds; and *Pope Gelasius*, *A. D.* 490. confirmed that Precept.

In Opposition to which Assertions, I dogmatically affirm,

First, "That *Christ's Institution of this Sacrament is virtually* "*a Command, which lays an Obligation on all the Faithful, as* "*much as in them lieth, to receive both kinds.*

Secondly, "*That it doth not appear either from the words of* "*our Saviour*, Joh. vi. *or from the practice of himself, or his* "*Disciples, that he left this practice indifferent.*

Thirdly, "*That it was the Custom of the Church for a Thou-* "*sand Years together, to give the Sacrament to the Sick, and to* "*Infants capable of Receiving it in both kinds.*

Fourthly, "*That neither* Leo, *nor* Gelasius *gave any new* "*Precept to the Church touching this matter.* And,

§. 2. *First, That Christ's Institution of this Sacrament is virtually a Command, obliging all the Faithful, as much as in them lieth, to receive both kinds*, will be apparent from these following Arguments:

1. That our Lord said in the Institution of this Sacrament, *Drink ye All of this.* For whereas *Romanists* pretend, That *Christ* said only, *Drink ye all of this, to them, to whom he said, when speaking of the Bread, Do this*; and that those words were only spoken to his *Apostles*, whom he then made *Priests*. To this

this I anſwer, That we have clear and convincing Evidence that theſe words, *Drink ye all of this*, are to be applied to others beſides the *Apoſtles*: As V. Gr. 1. From *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, whence I argue thus, *Chriſt* inſtituted no other Supper, than that which he adminiſtred to his *Diſciples*; if then he did not inſtitute that for *all Believers* capable, they have no right to any part of it, by virtue of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution; it can be unto them no Sacrament, for whom it was not inſtituted by *Chriſt*, ſince, by the definition of the * *Trent Council*, the Sacraments of the *New Teſtament* were *all inſtituted by him*; they can expect no bleſſing from it, ſince that depends upon *Chriſt*'s Ordinance; nay they muſt be eſteemed *Sacrilegious Uſurpers*, as laying claim to that Sacrament which never by *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution did belong unto them. If *Chriſt* did Inſtitute that Sacrament for all Believers capable, that is, to be a ſtanding Ordinance by which, as his *Diſciples* then did, ſo all Believers capable, ſhould afterwards eat of what he called his Body, and drink of what he called his Blood, then did he Inſtitute it to be received of all that were fitted for, and capable to receive it, and in it ſaid unto them, *Drink ye all of this.*

* Seſſ. 7. c. 1.

2. This appears farther from the Reaſon annexed to the Receiving of the Sacrament by *Chriſt's Apoſtles*; for ſince that Reaſon equally concerns all *Believers* capable, and fitted to Receive it, the Inſtitution muſt concern them all. Now the reaſon why *Chriſt* ſaid to his *Apoſtles*, *Take, and eat* what I have *broken*, is by himſelf declared to be this; becauſe it was *his Body broken*, or his *Body given* for them; take it, ſaith *Chriſt*, *this is my Body given for you*; this therefore being the Reaſon why they were to take, and eat, and this Reaſon concerning all Believers capable, and fitted to receive it, as much as the *Apoſtles*, and ſucceeding *Prieſts*, the Inſtitution, or command to take and eat muſt equally concern them. This Argument transferred unto the *Cup* runs thus: The Reaſon of the Participating of the *Cup*, *viz.* becauſe *it is the Blood of the New Teſtament*, *which is ſhed for the Remiſſion of Sins*, doth concern *Laicks* as well as *Prieſts*, his Blood being equally ſhed for both; therefore the Command, *Drink ye all of this*, to which the Reaſon is annexed, concerns them alſo. Again, another Reaſon why *Chriſt* ſaid to his *Apoſtles*, *Eat this Bread, and*

drink this Cup, was, that by so doing they might *remember his death*, his Body broken, and his Blood shed for them, saith St. *Luke*, and *shew it forth* till his second coming, saith St. *Paul*. Now this, as St. *Paul* clearly shews in his discourse to the *Corinthians*, and all the World believes, as well concerneth all Believers as it doth *Priests*; and therefore the drinking of the Cup, by which, as well as eating of the Bread, this Commemoration is by our *Lord*'s Institution to be made, must equally concern them.

A Second Argument to prove that *Lay*-men, by virtue of *Christ*'s Institution, have a right to, and are obliged to Receive this Cup of Blessing, is taken from these words of the Evangelist St. *Mark*, *And taking the Cup, giving thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it*; For here the *Evangelist* informs us, That *All the Apostles* drank of this Cup, and I presume, they did it, because our *Saviour* gave it to them for that end, for to what other end it should be given them the *Roman Doctors* have not yet inform'd us. Now hence it follows, that *Lay*-men also have a right to be partakers of the Cup; for the *Apostles* were then *Lay*-men; they being afterwards made *Priests* by our Lord's saying, after his Resurrection, *As my Father hath sent me, so send I you, receive the Holy Ghost*. For as our *Saviour* saith, *The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because Jesus was not glorified, or risen from the dead*. I know the *Roman Doctors*, and *J. L.* from the *Trent Council* teach, That the *Apostles were made Priests when Christ said, Do this*: and that then he gave them the *Chalice*, as Representatives of the *Clergy*, not of the People. But,

Chap. xiv. 23.

Joh. xx. 22.

Joh. vij 39.

Syn. Trid. Sess. 22. cap. 1.

1. Let it be considered how unlikely it is, that *Christ* should at one time institute Two Sacraments, as they esteem them, *viz.* that of *Ordination*, and the *Eucharist*, and yet speak nothing of the Use or the Reason, or the Benefit or the Necessity of one of them, nor tell them that he did so, nor explicate the Mystery, nor distinguish the Rite, or the Words, (though the nature of these Sacraments, being so extreamly different, required these things) but that he should leave all this to be supposed by the most improbable construction in the World.

2. If the *Apostles* were made *Priests* by, *Hoc facite*, *Do this*, spoken before the Institution of the *Chalice*, then must *Judas* also

alſo be made a *Prieſt* by *Chriſt*; for that he alſo did receive the Sacrament, is extreamly evident from theſe words of *Luke*, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood —— but behold the Hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the Table.* Luk. xxij. 20, 21.

And,

3. If the *Apoſtles* were made *Prieſts* by our *Lord*'s ſaying, *Do this*, then were they doubly Conſecrated, and the *Character* of *Prieſts* was twice imprinted on them, which contradicts the common tenet of all *Chriſtians*, that *the Sacrament of Orders is not to be reiterated*; and the peculiar Tenet of the *Church* of *Rome*, That *Sacraments which impreſs a Character muſt not be reiterated.* The reaſon of the Conſequence is plain, becauſe, as the *Apoſtle* witneſſes, our Lord ſaid, *Do this*, both after the giving of the Bread, and after the giving of the Cup. Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 7. Can. 9. 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

4. Had the *Apoſtles* been made *Prieſts* by our Lord's ſpeaking of theſe words to them, yet being not *Conficients*, they had no right to receive it as *Prieſts*, more than the *Laity*; for the fore-mentioned *Councils* have determined, That *Clerks being not Conficients, are by no Divine Right obliged to Receive under both Species.* There being then no difference betwixt them and the *Laity*, in reference to this matter, ſince *All the Apoſtles* drank of this Cup, why ſhould not the Laity do ſo too?

A Third Argument to prove that Lay-men, by virtue of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, are obliged to receive the Cup of Bleſſing, is taken from the Recapitulation of our Lord's Inſtitution by St. *Paul*, who doth expreſly teach us, That *our Lord Jeſus, in the ſame Night in which he was betrayed, took the Cup, ſaying, This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.* Now in the Three *Evangeliſts* no ſuch words are expreſsly to be found; nor any thing like them ſpoken at the diſtribution of the Cup, unleſs theſe words, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Teſtament, that is ſhed for many, for the Remiſſion of Sins*, be of like import with the words of St. *Paul*. Since therefore the *Apoſtle* doth expreſly teach, That our *Lord* uſed theſe words at his laſt Supper, and that he received them from the *Lord*, as words which he had ſpoken, then what remains, but they virtually are the ſame with thoſe recorded by St. *Matthew*; and then they muſt alſo be a Command obliging all to drink 1 Cor. xi. 25.

of this Cup, as being the Memorial of the Blood of the New Testament shed for them, and therefore to be drunk by all, in the remembrance of the Blood shed for them, as often as they did present themselves to Celebrate that *Holy Mystery*. I say, obliging all that are capable, when they present themselves before God, to Celebrate the memory of his precious Death, and his Blood shed for their Redemption, to drink of that Cup, which is the Memorial and Symbol of his Blood shed for them. For sure, the means which *Christ* appointed for such an end, ought to be used by all who are obliged to pursue that end: Since therefore all *Christians* are obliged Sacramentally to remember, That *Christ* shed his Blood for them, and by that Blood shed, confirmed the *New Covenant* to them; and since *Christ* hath appointed the drinking of this Cup, and this alone, to be the memorial of his Blood shed, all *Christians*, capable of doing so, must be obliged, when they do Sacramentally Commemorate these Mercies, to drink of this Cup. And this demonstratively follows from the ensuing words, *Do this, as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me*; *for as often as you eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, you shew the Lord's death till he come*; for they do manifest, that as well by drinking of the Cup, as eating of the Bread the *Lord*'s Death is shewed, and that until his second coming; both these things are to be done in order to that end: And since these words are not the words of *Christ*, but of St. *Paul*, who speaks here of the whole *Church* of *Corinth*; the words preceeding, *Do this, as oft as you shall drink it, in remembrance of me*, must belong also to all the Members of that *Church*, because of the connective Particle which joins the 25*th* and 26*th* Verses, and makes it necessary that the same persons should be spoken to in the words. *This do*, &c. and in the following words, *For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup*. And if this was the Duty of the whole *Church* of *Corinth*, it must be equally the Duty of the whole *Church* of *Christ*, there being no peculiar reason why the *Church* of *Corinth* should be obliged to drink this Cup, in order to these ends, more than all other *Christian Churches*.

Vers. 26.

And when our *Lord* hath taken so great Care to tell us, That the Bread is *his broken Body*, and therefore is to be eaten in remembrance of him, *i. e.* of his Body broken; that the

Cup

Cup is *the New-Taſtament in his Blood*, and therefore is to be drank in remembrance of his Blood ſhed for us: When his *Apoſtle* doth as diſtinctly ſay, *The Bread which we break is the Communion of the Body of Chriſt, the Cup which we bleſs is the Communion of the Blood*; and neither of them have hinted in the leaſt, that the Cup is the Communion of his Body, or the Bread of his Blood, but by a particular and ſeparate inſtitution, diſtribution, and ſignification aſcribed to them, have ſtrongly inſinuated the contrary; for men, after all this to ſay one of theſe Species will ſuffice, for the Bread is as well the blood ſhed as the broken Body, and the participation of it is the Communion of the Blood of *Chriſt*, and that by the partaking of it, we do as well remember and ſhew forth the ſhedding of his Blood upon the Croſs, as by the partaking of the Cup, is to my apprehenſion an affront offered to our dear *Lord*, and to the Wiſdom of the *Holy Ghoſt*. 1 Cor. x. 16.

In Anſwer to theſe Arguments, ſome of the *Roman Doctors* are pleaſed to ſay, that this Diſcourſe of the *Apoſtle* imports *only a conditional Order to do this in Remembrance of Jeſus Chriſt, as often as one ſhall do it, and not an order abſolutely to do it.*

To this I Anſwer, 1*ſt*. He who not only doth command us at the celebration of the Sacrament, to remember his Blood ſhed, but alſo Inſtitutes a ſign for the memorial of it, and doth command us to uſe this ſign, becauſe it is appointed to be the memorial of it; commands us when we receive the Sacrament, to receive that ſign, for he who wills the end, muſt will the means which he hath inſtituted for the accompliſhing that end; but this doth *Chriſt*, for he inſtitutes a Cup of Wine to repreſent his Blood ſhed; he ſaith, *Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood ſhed*, this I command you to do in remembrance of me: He therefore doth command us when we receive the Sacrament to receive this ſign, which, in his Inſtitution of this Sacrament, he appointed as the means of this remembrance.

2*dly*. He who commands us to drink this Cup, *as oft as we drink it in remembrance of him*, becauſe we do by drinking of it *ſhew forth the Lords Death till he come*, commands us to do it as oft as we receive the Sacrament, ſeeing as oft as we receive the Sacrament, we ſhew forth the Lord's Death; but *Chriſt*, ſaith the *Apoſtle*, did lay upon us this command for this very Reaſon, ſaying, *Do this, as oft as you ſhall drink it, in remembrance*

membrance of me, for as often as you shall eat this Bread and drink this Cup, you shew forth the Lord's Death till he come.

3*dly*. Where there is parity of Reason, there the command may very well be deemed of equal latitude and extent, for *ratio legis est lex*, where there is equal reason to command, there may we reasonably suppose the will of the *Law-giver* to be equal in commanding, but there is equal reason why our *Lord* should absolutely command the drinking of the Cup in remembrance of his Blood shed, as why he absolutely should say, touching the eating of the Bread, *Do this in remembrance of me*, the one being as much the Symbol of his Blood shed, as is the other of his broken Body, and the one shewing forth his Death as much as doth the other; we therefore have no cause to doubt, but that he equally intended the doing both in order to this end.

§. 3. Second, *That it doth not appear either from the words of our Saviour*, Joh. vi. *or from the practice of himself or his Disciples, that he left this practice indifferent*, will be made evident from an impartial consideration both of our *Saviour*'s words and of his practice, and first to clear up the true meaning of our *Lord*'s Discourse in the Sixth Chapter of St. *John*; Let it be observed,

First, That our *Lord*'s mystical Expressions of *labouring for the Meat that doth not perish*, of *eating the true Bread from Heaven*, are by himself plainly expounded to import only the believing on him, or the embracing of him as their *Prophet* and their *Saviour*; for when he had exhorted them *to labour for the meat that did not perish*, he tells them, *v.* 29. That this was *to believe on him that God had sent*; when he had told them, *v.* 35. That *he was the Bread from Heaven*, he immediately adds, *He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst*. Having said, that he was *the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life unto the World*, *v.* 33. He confirms this Expression, *v.* 40. by these words, *This is the Will of my Father, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him should have eternal Life*. And again, *v.* 47. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting Life, I am that Bread of Life.*

Secondly, Observe, that nothing was more common among the *Eastern Nations*, than to express the Actions of believing, embracing,

embracing, and obeying the words of *Wisdom*, or hearkening to her Councils and Instructions, by eating and by drinking of them: Thus Wisdom cryeth in the Streets, saith *Solomon*, *Come eat of my Bread, and drink of my Wine that I have mingled*; that is, *Go in the way of understanding*, v. 6. *Eat you that which is good, and let your Soul delight it self in Fatness*; that is, *Incline your Ear, hear, and your Soul shall live.* And by the Son of *Syrach* Wisdom is introduced speaking thus, *They that eat me shall yet be hungry, and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty*, Ecclus. xxiv. 21. *i. e. He that obeys me*, v. 22. Hence *Philo* the *Jew* informs us, That, τὸ φάγειν ἐστι σύμβολον τρόφης ψυχικῆς, *to eat is a Symbol of Spiritual nourishment.* Add to this that of Mr. *Leightfoot*, That *the Talmudists make frequent mention of eating the Messiah*, and thereby understand only their being made partakers of his Benefits: And that of *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, upon that passage of St. *Paul*, *I have fed you with Milk, and not with strong Meat*, viz. *Milk is the rudiments of Faith, or the Doctrines of the Catechism, the first nourishment of the Soul, strong meat, a comtemplation which makes us to discern the divine power and essence*, σάρκες αὐτοῦ καὶ αἷμα τοῦ λόγου; *these*, Contemplations, *are the Flesh and Blood of the Word*; Βρῶσις γὰρ καὶ πόσις τοῦ θείου λόγου ἡ γνῶσις ἐστι τῆς θείας οὐσίας, *the meat and drink of the divine Word is the knowledge of the divine Essence.*

Vide Leight. Hor. Hebr. in Joh. p. 112, 113. Prov. ix. 5. Isa. lv. 2. In Joh. vi. v. 51. Strom. l. 5. p. 579.

Thirdly, Observe that from these *Metaphors* our *Lord* proceeds to that contained in these words objected by the *Roman Doctors*, v. 51. *The Bread which I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World*; that is, It is my Body which I will give up unto death, that by it the world may have life, which is a greater Benefit exceedingly than that which you received from that *Manna* which *Moses* gave you in the Wilderness, or from that meat with which I did so lately fill your Bodies. The *Jews* taking these words in a gross sence, as if our Lord had promised to give his *real Flesh to be swallowed down their Throats, and eaten by them as they had eaten Bread the day before*, and as their fore-*Fathers* had eaten *Manna* in the Wilderness, exclaimed against him, as promising a thing absurd, inhumane and imposible, saying, *How can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?* to this our *Saviour* Answers, v. 53. in words still more expressive of his violent and bloody Death for the salvation of Mankind; *viz. Except you eat my Flesh, and drink my Blood*,

Blood, &c. Now these words are by some conceived to import thus much, *Unless you with the Mouth of your Bodies do eat my real and corporeal Flesh, and drink my proper Blood, you cannot have eternal Life.*

Having premised these Observations, I shall now proceed to shew both from this *Chapter*, and from other Reasons, that our *Lord* spake not here of *oral* and *coporeal* eating of his natural Flesh, and drinking of his proper Blood, but only of doing of these things *spiritually*; and that not only in the celebration of that *Sacrament* which by our Lord was Instituted for the remembrance of his Death and Passion, but generally believing that by his Death and Passion he became the *Saviour* of the World, and purchased Pardon and Salvation for all that heartily believed in him, and would sincerely yield Obedience to his precepts. And,

1. Against the gross, and for the spiritual Interpretation of these words I argue from the 51. *v.* thus, The Flesh which Christ here promised to *give for the Life of the World*, is the same with *the Bread of God that cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life unto the World*, *v.* 33. for so we learn expresly from these words; *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven, if any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever*; *and the Bread which I will give is my Flesh, that I will give for the Life of the World.* And again, having said, *He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood hath eternal Life*, v. 54. and *he that eateth me shall live by me*, *v.* 57. he adds immediately, *This is the Bread which came down from Heaven —— and he that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever.* Now our Lord hath expresly taught us, that the eating of this Bread of Life imported only our believing on him, *v.* 35. as hath already been made evident from our second Observation; therefore the eating of his Flesh doth certainly import the same spiritual Action. Moreover we are only to eat of *Christ* as *Flesh*, in that importance of the Phrase in which we are to eat of Christ as *Bread*, for as Christ saith, he will give *Flesh to eat*, so doth he say, he will give *Bread to eat*; as he saith, *He that eateth of my Flesh shall live for ever*, so he saith *He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever*; but none can say that *Christ* was or could properly be Bread, or eaten by the Mouth as such, wherefore he being only figuratively and spiritually Bread, could only figuratively and spiritually be

be eaten as Bread; if therefore in the ſame importance only we are to eat his Fleſh, that alſo is to be eaten in a ſpiritual Sence.

2. From theſe words, *v.* 52. *How can this Man give us his Fleſh to eat?* 'tis evident the *Jews* conceived that our *Lord* promiſed to give them his proper Fleſh to eat, and ſwallow down their Throats, as they had done the Bread with which he fed them. And it on all hands is agreed, that they miſtook the ſence of *Chriſt*'s words, and fanſied ſuch a meaning of them as he did not intend; but had our *Lord* intended the *corporeal* eating of his Fleſh and drinking of his Blood, 'tis certain that it muſt be ſwallowed down their Throats, as properly as was the Bread which they had eaten; and therefore no Man who maintaineth this corporeal eating of *Chriſt*'s Fleſh to be intended here, can, ſuitably to his Opinion, ſay, That they impoſed a falſe ſence upon our *Saviour*'s words, ſince from this ſence it does inevitably follow, that *Chriſt* intended that his humane Fleſh ſhould properly be eaten; and their words ſignifie no more. Add to this one Conſideration, which ſhews what apprehenſions the *Fathers* of the firſt Three *Centuries* had of this eating of the Fleſh of *Chriſt*, *viz.* when 'twas objected to them by the *Heathens* that they did *eat Man's Fleſh*, they conſtantly in their *Apologies* reject the accuſation as the vileſt calumny, and as a moſt abominable thing ſufficient to diſcover that the *Author* of ſuch an inſtitution muſt be ſome wicked *Dæmon*, ἀνθρωπείων σάρκων Βόρας ὐ γινόσκωμεν; *We Chriſtians*, ſaith (*a*) *Juſtin Martyr*, *do not own the eating of humane fleſh*, it is an infamous thing, and falſly is reported of us: This is, ſaith (*b*) *Theophilus*, the moſt *wicked* and *inhumane* of all Crimes objected to us, σαρκῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἡμᾶς ἐφάπτεσθαι; *that we partake of humane fleſh*, it is not poſſible we ſhould be guilty of ſo vile a thing. *Amongſt us there is no eating of Man's fleſh*, ſaith (*c*) *Tatian*, you *are falſe witneſſes* who ſay this of us. *No Man*, ſaith (*d*) *Athenagoras*, *who is not mad*, can charge us with this thing, ὐ γὰρ ἔστι πάσασθαι κρεῶν ἀνθρωπικῶν; *for we may not eat humane fleſh.* It is the Calumny of the *Devil*, ſaith (*e*) *Minutius*. *You may be aſhamed to object it to us* Chriſtians, ſaith (*f*) *Tertullian*; whereas had they received this as an Article of *Chriſtian* Faith, that they did daily eat the Fleſh of the Man Chriſt, and thought that this Diſcourſe

(*a*) Apol. 2. p. 70. 1. 50.

(*b*) Ad Autol. l. 3 p. 119, 126.

(*c*) Παρ' ἡμῖν ὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρωποφαγία, Contr. Græc. p. 162.

(*d*) Legat. p. 38.

(*e*) P. 32.

(*f*) Apol. cap. 9.

not only taught, but even obliged them so to do, I know not with what Truth or what Sincerity they could, without all limitation or exception, not only have denied, but even detested the doing so.

But that which puts it without doubt, that *Christians* in the *Primitive Ages* had no apprehension, that *Christ* by this Discourse had taught them, that his proper flesh and Blood was to be eaten in the Sacrament, is the memorable History of *Sanctus* and *Blandina*, two *Christian Martyrs*, written by *Irenæus* Bishop of *Lions*, and preserved to us in (*h*) *Oecumenius* thus. That *the Heathens having apprehended the Servants of Christians Catechized, and using force with them, that from them they might learn something secret; the Servants having nothing to say that might be pleasing to their Tormentors, in as much as they had heard from their Masters, that the Holy Sacrament was the Body and Blood of Christ,* αὐτοὶ νομίσαντες τὸ ὄντι αἷμα καὶ σάρκα εἶναι τοῦτο ἐξεῖπον τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσι; *they thinking that it had indeed been flesh and blood, told this to the Inquisitors, who apprehending,* ὡς αὐτόχρημα τοῦτο πεπραχότας Χριστιανοὺς, *as if the Christians had done that very thing, gave notice of it to other Heathens, and they endeavoured by torments to force the Martyrs,* Sanctus *and* Blandina, *to confess it, to whom* Blandina *readily and boldly answered, saying, How should they endure these things who so fast as not to enjoy lawful Flesh.* This, I say, is a clear indication, that the *Ancient Christians* did not believe that in this Sacrament they did eat *Christ's* proper flesh and blood, or that our *Lord* did here require them to do so; for if they had thus thought, how could *Irenæus* have represented it as a plain mistake, both in these *Servants* and these *Heathens*, to think the Sacrament was, τὸ ὄντι, *really Christ's flesh and blood*; and that the *Christians* by receiving of it did really eat Flesh and Blood? How could he have introduced *Blandina* refuting this Imagination, had it been the Sentiment of the then *Church* of *Christ*, since by so doing, she must have rejected one great Article of *Christian* Faith? How, lastly, could *Oecumenius* have inserted these words into his Commentary, without endeavouring to sweeten, and explain, and reconcile them to the Doctrine of the proper Manducation of *Christ's* Flesh and Blood.

(*h*) In 1 Pet. ii. 12. p. 149. g. a.

Again, since that this Doctrine came into the world, that is, since it was broached first by *Paschasius* in the *Ninth Century*, the Assertors of it give two Reasons why, though we

corporally

corporally eat that very Fleſh which ſuffered on the Croſs, and drink *that very Blood which was then ſhed* corporeally, yet is that Fleſh and Blood concealed from our outward Senſes under the ſhape of Bread and Wine. The *firſt* is this, (*i*) *Ut ridiculum nullum fiat Paganis quod cruorem occiſi hominis bibamus*, *that we might not be ridiculous to the* Pagans, *by eating humane Fleſh, and drinking the Blood of a ſlain Man*; *for this*, ſaith he, *would make our Religion execrable, and cauſe them to condemn the Chriſtians as the vileſt of Men*: And again, ſhould the ſhape of Fleſh appear, it would be (*k*) *Perfidis execratio*, *execrable to the Heathens*. 'Tis thus concealed, ſaith (*l*) *Algerus*, *Ne infidelibus pateat, & eorum Blaſphemiis vileſcat*, *Leaſt it ſhould appear to Infidels, and lie open to their Blaſphemies, and leaſt they ſhould judge us inhumane and cruel, as being eaters and drinkers of humane Fleſh and Blood. Secondly*, Leaſt *Chriſtians perceiving things raw and bloody, ſhould be filled with horrour*, ſaith (*m*) *Lanfrank*, leaſt *if the Faithful ſhould perceive the Colour and the taſte of Fleſh and Blood*, humana pietas abhorreret, *humane piety ſhould abhorr the Action*, ſaith (*n*) *Algerus*. Should it appear thus, ſaith (*o*) *Hugo Lingonenſis*, *Rarius in terris eſſet qui hoc non abhorreret*, *There would be ſcarce a Man on Earth that would not abhorr it. It would*, ſaith (*p*) *Petrus Cluniacenſis*, Fidem lædere, vel ad ſcandalum quorumlibet poſſit corda movere, *Be prejudicial to the Faith, and ſcandalize the Minds of all Men*. The profit of the receiving the Sacrament would be hindred, ſaith (*q*) *Algerus*, *by the horror of eating humane fleſh*, quoniam Chriſtum vorari dentibus fas non eſt, *for it is not lawful to devour Chriſt with the Teeth*. Now let us in the fear of God conſider, whether that Sence of *Scripture* is to be received, which makes that certainly to be believed by the eye of Faith, which if it were perceived by the Eye of Senſe, would render our Religion Ridiculous, and execrable to the *Pagan* World; which, did we ſee our ſelves but ready to perform what actually we do, we ſhould utterly abhorr to do, and ſhould be horribly ſcandalized at our own Actions, which did Men ſee us do, they could not but eſteem us cruel and inhumane: Since that the *Heathens* have underſtood this is become an *Article* of *Chriſtian* Faith, do they not open their Mouths in *Blaſphemies* againſt us, as freely as if they ſaw us eat and drink *Chriſt*'s

(*i*) C. 13. Al. 36.
(*k*) C. 37.
(*l*) Alger. l. 2. c. 3. f. 15. b.
(*m*) F. 133. b.
(*n*) L. 2. c. 3.
(*o*) P. 224.
(*p*) P. 215. b.

(*q*) Impediretur perceptionis ejus commoditas pro humani corporis comedendi horrore injecto. *L.* 1. *c.* 7. *l.* 1. *c.* 16.

flesh and blood corporeally? Did not (r) *Averroes* declare in the 12*th*. Century, *He found no Sect more foolish than the Christians, because they ate the very God they worshipped*? Doth not (s) *Achmed Ben Edris* say, *We use Christ worse than did the Jews, because it is more Savage to eat his flesh and drink his blood, than only to procure his Death*? Do not the (t) *Mahometans* point at us, saying, There goes a *God-eater*? And doth not then this their Doctrine render their Religion as plainly Execrable and Ridiculous to the *Heathen* world, as if they saw them eat of humane flesh and drink of humane blood?

(r) Apud Dionys. Carth. in Sent. 4. Dist. 10. Art. 1.

(s) Apud Hotting. Hist. Eccl. Sæc. 16. Part. 2. p. 160.

(t) Monsieur la Boulay Voyag. part. 1. c. 10. p. 21.

3. The 53. *v*. affords two further Arguments in Refutation of the *corporeal* Sence of these Expressions, 1. That it follows plainly from it, that the *Thief* upon the *Cross*, and all the pious and believing *Jews* who heard these words, and died before our *Saviour*'s Passion, must of necessity be damned, for our *Lord* saith with an *asseveration* to them, *Except you eat the flesh, &c.* now this was said at least above a Year before our *Saviour*'s Passion, and so before the Institution of that Sacrament, in which alone his flesh could be corporally eaten; and therefore had it been intended of *corporeal* and sacramental eating, it was impossible that any person of those Hearers could be saved, who died in the ensuing year. 2. These words interpreted in the corporeal Sence do plainly and inevitably inferr, That they who do deprive the *Laity* all their whole lives of drinking of this blood, expose them to inevitable damnation, *Christ* having said, *Except you drink the Blood of the Son of Man, you have no Life in you*; for though eating and drinking being taken figuratively, do signifie the same thing, *viz*. believing in a crucified *Saviour*; yet being taken properly, they cannot be reputed the same thing: For albeit they who receive the body only, may be well said to eat the flesh of *Christ*, because they take something by way of Meat into their Mouths, yet cannot they be said to drink his blood, if they take nothing into their Mouths by way of Drink: Since therefore eating and drinking are two distinct Actions, so that he cannot properly be said to drink, who only eats, since the privation of Life is here connected with not drinking of *Christ*'s blood, as much as with not eating of his flesh, according to the corporeal Interpretation

Joh. vi. 4.

pretation of theſe words, he muſt certainly be deprived of the Life here promiſed, who doth not receive the Cup; becauſe he is deprived of drinking of the Blood of Chriſt.

4. From *Verſ.* 54, 56. the Argument runs thus, whoſoever eateth the Fleſh, and drinketh the Blood of Chriſt in the ſence here ſpoken of, *abideth in Chriſt, and Chriſt in him*; and therefore is a true and living Member of Chriſt's Body, and he *ſhall have Eternal Life*, and be partaker of an happy *Reſurrection*, and ſo no perſon can be either wicked here, or deprived of Everlaſting Life hereafter, who in this ſence here mentioned eats of the Fleſh, and drinketh of the Blood of Chriſt. Now this is very true of eating Spiritually, and by Faith, as it imports believing on *Chriſt*; for *This*, ſaith Chriſt, *is the Will of him that ſent me, That every one who believeth on the Son may have Everlaſting Life; and I will raiſe him up at the laſt Day*: but then of Sacramental eating of *Chriſt*'s Fleſh, it is as falſe; for this was eaten by a *Judas*, and continually is eaten by Millions who are both wicked here, and will be damned hereafter; this therefore cannot be the import of our *Saviour*'s words: and here obſerve, 1. That our Lord ſpeaks in the general, *whoſoever eats*. 2. That he ſpeaks thus, not by way of Promiſe, which might be conditional, but by way of plain Aſſertion, and declaration of a thing moſt certain. And, 3. That the Text ſhews the eating mentioned here, can never be performed unprofitably, no not without the greateſt benefit; for 'tis oppoſed to the eating of *Manna* in the Wilderneſs, on this account, that whereas that gave only Temporal Life, this would aſſuredly conferr Eternal; whereas that was not able to preſerve from Temporal, this would preſerve from Death Eternal. *Verſ.* 40.

5. Moreover, *Verſ.* 61, & 62. our Lord ſpeaks thus, *Doth this offend you, what if you ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before*: *i. e.* are you offended that I thus ſpeak of giving you my Fleſh to eat; do you look on this Expreſſion *now* as ſo abſurd and unintelligible, what then will you think of it, when this Body ſhall be removed hence to Heaven? *i. e.* How will you then be ſcandalized, and think it ſtill more difficult, and more impoſſible to apprehend how you ſhould eat my Fleſh and drink my Blood, provided you go on to underſtand my words in the groſs carnal Sence. For *Athanaſius*

(u) In illud Evang. Quicunque dixerit, p. 979.

sius (u) saith well, That Christ here mentioneth his ascent into Heaven, ἵνα τῆς σωματικῆς ἐννοίας αὐτοὺς ἀφελκύσῃ, *That he might divert them from the corporeal sence*; and therefore argued thus, "Seing it will be hen impossible that you should corporally "eat my Flesh, when it is so far removed from you; by this "you may discern, I speak of a spiritual eating of it. Whence by the way we learn, That *Christ* thought his Ascention into Heaven sufficient demonstration to the *Jews*, his Flesh could not be eaten upon Earth; and why it should not be so to the *Christian* I am yet to learn.

6. The 63. *Vers.* affords us a more plain and certain Exposition of our *Saviour*'s meaning in the precedent words; for thus they run, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth*; *the Flesh profiteth nothing*; (x) *The words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life:* For the import of these words is to this effect; unto that eating and drinking, of which in this Discourse I have still spoken, I have annexed the Promise of Life, saying expressly, *He that eateth me shall live by me*; he shall by me be quickned: Now all Men know, That 'tis the Spirit in them that gives them Life, and when that Spirit is taken from them, the Flesh cannot live, or minister to the continuance of their Life; by which similitude you may plainly learn, I spake not of my real Flesh, when I told you, that by eating it, you should have Life, but of my Word and Doctrine, that of my *Passion* more especially; for my words which I speak to you, they are Spirit, and they are Life; *i. e.* if you will hearken to them, they will make you live Spiritually here, Eternally hereafter, and by so doing will be Life: yea, where they are embraced, they are that to the new Man, which is the Spirit to the Flesh; they give him Life, Activity, and Motion, and therefore they are Spirit. Had our Lord said, it is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing, *therefore the Flesh which I will give, shall be still joined to my Divinity, and by the virtue of it give you Life*, he had said somewhat

(x) Ἃ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή ἐστι, δι' ὧν ἐπαίδευεν αὐτοὺς πνευματικῶς ἀκούειν τῶν περὶ τῆς σάρκος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ λελεγμένων· μὴ γὰρ τὴν σάρκα τὴν περίκειμαι νομίσετέ με λέγειν, ὡς δέον αὐτὴν ἐσθίειν· μηδὲ τὸ αἰσθητὸν καὶ σωματικὸν αἷμα πίνειν ὑπολαμβάνετέ με προστάττειν· ἀλλ' εὖ ἴστε ὅτι τὰ ῥήματά μου ἃ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή ἐστι· ὥστε αὐτὰ εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα ὧν ὁ μετέχων ἀεὶ, ὡσανεὶ ἄρτῳ οὐρανίῳ τρεφόμενος τῆς οὐρανίου μεθέξει ζωῆς. Μὴ δὴ οὖν φησὶ σκανδαλιζέτω ὑμᾶς τοῦτο ὅ περὶ βρώσεως τῆς ἐμῆς σάρκος, καὶ περὶ πόματος τοῦ ἐμοῦ αἵματος εἰρηκα· μηδὲ ταραττέτω ὑμᾶς ἡ πρόχειρος ἀκοὴ τῶν περὶ τῆς σάρκος καὶ αἵματος εἰρημένων μοι· ταῦτα γὰρ οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ αἰσθητῶς ἀκουόμενα· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν τοὺς πνευματικῶς ἀκούειν διωαμένους. Euseb. de Ecclesiastic. Theolog. l. 3. c. 12.

what like the ſence which others put upon this Text; but ſaying only, *The words which I ſpeak unto you, they are Spirit*, we cannot doubt but he ſpeaks of eating and of drinking of his words ſpiritually.

7. Our *Saviour* having ſaid unto the Twelve, *Will ye alſo go away?* St. *Peter* Anſwers, *To whom ſhould we go? Thou haſt the words of eternal Life, and we believe thou art that Chriſt the Son of the living God.* Where, (1.) obſerve, that *Peter* here doth as it were repeat the words of *Chriſt*; *My words are Life*, ſaith *Chriſt*; *Thou haſt the words of Life eternal*, ſaith St. *Peter*; whereas, if he had underſtood our *Saviour*, to have ſpoken here of *Oral* Manducation, his *Anſwer* would in all probability have been to this effect, *Whatſoever appearance there may be of inhumanity, abſurdneſs, and impoſſibility in eating of thy natural Fleſh, and drinking of thy Blood; yet we believe it, becauſe thou haſt ſaid it, who art Truth it ſelf, and who art able to make good thy words*; we therefore hearing nothing of this tendance from him, we may conclude, that he knew nothing of this import of them. And, 2. obſerve, that he thought it ſufficient to ſay, *We believe thou art the Chriſt*, which if our Lord ſpake here of *Oral* Manducation, was nothing to the purpoſe, but if he only ſpake of ſpiritual eating of him, was the very thing which was deſigned by our *Lord* in this Diſcourſe, and which he ſpake of in thoſe words, which ſo much offended others. We therefore conclude with *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, That (y) *when our Lord ſaid, Eat my Fleſh and drink my Blood, he allegorically meant the drinking of Faith, and of the Promiſes, and that our Lord is by way of Allegory to thoſe that believe in him, Meat, Fleſh, and Nouriſhment, and Bread, and Blood.* With *Tertullian*, That (z) *our Lord all along urged his intent by Allegory, calling his word fleſh, as being to be hungred after, that we might have Life*; auditu devorandus, ruminandus intellectu, & fide digerendus, *to be devoured by the Ear, ruminated upon by the mind, and by Faith digeſted.* With *Origen*, That (a) *we are ſaid to drink his Blood, when we receive his words, in which Life conſiſts,*

(y) Φάγεσθέ μου τὰς σάρκας εἰπὼν, καὶ πίεσθέ μου τὸ αἷμα· Ἐναργὴς ἡ πίστεως καὶ τῆς εὐαγγελίας τὸ πρόσημον ἀλληγορῶν, &c. Pædag. lib. 1. cap. 6. pag. 100. Τὸ δὲ αἷμα δὶς ἀλληγορεῖται, &c. ibid. pag. 104, 105.

(z) De Reſur. Carn. cap. 36, 37.

(a) Bibere autem dicimur ſanguinem Chriſti — cum ſermones ejus recipimus. *Hom.* 16. *in. Num. fol.* 123. Caro ejus verus eſt cibus, & ſanguis ejus verus eſt potus, carnibus enim & ſanguine verbi ſui, tanquam mundo cibo ac potu, potat, & reficit omne hominum genus. *Hom.* 7. *in Levit. fol.* 73.

that

that *his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed, because he feedeth all Mankind with the flesh and blood of his word, as with pure meat and drink.* With (*b*) *Eusebius*, That *his Words and Doctrines are Flesh and Blood.* With *Athanasius*, That (*c*) *the words which Christ spake were not carnal but spiritual; for how many could his Body have sufficed for Meat, that it should be made the Food of the whole World.* With St. *Austin* (*d*) *Ut quid paras dentes, & ventrem, crede & manducasti, credere enim in eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum, why providest thou Teeth and a Belly, believe, and thou hast eaten, for to believe in him, is to eat the living Bread.* And lastly with (*e*) St. *Jerom*, *In the truest Sence, the Body and the Blood of Christ is the Word and Doctrine of the Scripture:* Caro Christi & sanguis ejus in auribus nostris infunditur, *the flesh and blood of Christ is poured into our Ears.* We say in the Language of *Origen*, (*f*) *Si filii estis Ecclesiæ, — agnoscite quia figuræ sunt, — si enim secundum literam sequaris; If you are Sons of the Church, own these things to be Figures, for if you follow the Letter, this very saying, Except you eat the Flesh, is a killing Letter:* In the words of (*g*) *Eusebius* pronounced in the name of *Christ*, *Do not think that I speak of that Flesh with which I am compassed, as if you must eat of that, neither imagine that I command you to drink of my sensible and bodily Blood, but understand well, that the words that I have spoken to you, they are Spirit and Life*; for, as St. *Austin* saith, touching the Exposition of Scripture Phrases, (*h*) *If the saying be preceptive, either forbiding a wicked Action, or commanding that which is good, it is no figurative Speech, but if it seems to command any wickedness, or to forbid what is profitable and good, it is figurative. This saying, Except you eat, &c. seems to command a wicked thing, it is therefore a figure, enjoining us to communicate in the Passion of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably to remember that his Flesh was wounded and Crucified for us.*

(*b*) Ubi supra.

(*c*) Ἵνα μάθωσιν ὅτι οὐ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐκ τῆς σαρκικὰ, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὰ, πόσοις γὰρ ἤρκει τὸ σῶμα πρὸς βρῶσιν; ἵνα καὶ τῷ κόσμῳ πάντῳ τοῦτο τρόφιμον γένῃ. Tom. 1. pag. 979.

(*d*) Tract. 25. in. Johan. Tom. 9. p. 218. & Tract. 26. p. 223.

(*e*) Licet & in Mysterio possit intelligi, tamen verius Corpus Christi, & sanguis ejus sermo scripturarum est. *In Psal.* 147. *fol.* 94. a.

(*f*) Hom. 7. in Levit. *ibid.*

(*g*) Ubi supra.

(*h*) De Doctrin. Christiana li. 3. cap. 16.

§. 4. 2. I should proceed Secondly to shew, That it doth not appear from the practice of *Christ* himself in breaking Bread, and giving it unto Two *Disciples* at *Emaus*; nor from the practice of his *Disciples*, who are said to have *continued in breaking*

Luc. xxiv. 30.

Acts ij. 42.

of

of Bread, and who were *gathered together to break Bread*; that both our *Lord* and his *Diſciples* communicated in one kind only: But theſe Pretenſions have been ſo fully anſwered by a late excellent Diſcourſe of *Communion in one kind*, in Anſwer to the *Biſhop* of *Meaux* from Pag. 22 to 28, that it is ſuperfluous further to inſiſt upon them, eſpecially ſeeing the Author of the (*i*) *Hiſtory* of the *Trent Council* hath informed us, that 'twas the Judgment of ſome of the *Fathers* there, That *all theſe places muſt be laid aſide as impertinent to this matter, or inſufficient to prove that for which they are produced, becauſe had they concerned the Euchariſt, they muſt have been Inſtances, not only of taking, but alſo of conſecrating the Holy Sacrament in one kind, and ſo by them it would be concluded that it was not Sacrilege to conſecrate one kind without the other*; which, ſay they, *is contrary to all the Doctors, and the meaning of the Church, and overthroweth the diſtinction of the Euchariſt, as it is a Sacrifice, and as it is a Sacrament.*

Acts xx. 7.

(*i*) Li 6. pag. 486.

§. 5.

3. Waving this therefore, I proceed Thirdly to ſhew, that *it was the Cuſtom of the Church to give the Sacrament to the Sick, and to Infants capable of receiving of it, in both kinds.* And,

1. Whereas *J. L.* doth with true *Romiſh* confidence affirm, *That all ancient Writers do atteſt, that it was the cuſtom to give this Sacrament under one kind to the Sick*; the contrary is extreamly evident, not only by the inſtances collected by the learned (*k*) *Dally*, of Sick Perſons who communicated in both kinds from the 4th. to the 10th. Century, but alſo from the *Canons* of the whole *Church* of *Chriſt*; for in the third Century St. *Cyprian*, and the *Presbyters* of *Rome* inform us, That *they had agreed that* (*l*) *if the lapſed Penitents were indangered by ſickneſs*, and they were nigh to Death's door, *they ſhould be admitted to the peace of the Church*, and that *they ſhould be relieved in the thing which they deſired.* How was it that they did relieve the infirm when Death approached? even the ſame way that they did the ſtrong, (*m*) *Protectione ſanguinis, & corporis Chriſti, With the protection of the Body and the Blood of Chriſt*, ſaith *Cyprian*. What was it that they deſired, and ſome of them invaded? St. *Cyprian* informs us that it was (*n*) *Sanctum Domini, The Holy of the Lord*; it was the *Euchariſt*

(*k*) De Cultu Lat. l. 5. c. 11. p. 641, 642.

(*l*) Si urgere exitus ceperit. *Ep.* 18. Si premi infirmitate aliqua & periculo cœperint. *Ep.* 19. Si de Sæculo excederint. *Ep.* 20. item *Ep.* 30, 31.

(*m*) Ep. 57.

(*n*) Ep. 31.

rist, that is, *the Body and the Blood of Christ*; which St. *Cyprian* shews plainly, by saying it ought not to be given to them till they had done penance, confessed and received imposition of hands, because it is written, (o) *He that eats the Bread or drinks the Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* What was it that they endeavoured to extort? St. *Cyprian* saith, It was (p) *the Body and the Blood of Christ*, being angry with, and even threatning the *Priests*, that *they did not* (q) *presently receive the Body of Christ into their defiled Hands, or drink the Blood of the Lord with their polluted Mouth.* What was it that *Trophimus* a lapsed *Priest* was admitted to? St. *Cyprian* saith, It was (r) *Lay-Communion.* Now what that was, (s) *Rigaltius* upon the place informs us, saying, That it was *the participation of both Species, but as a Lay-man, not in the Order of Priests*, to which having once lapsed, he was not by the Discipline of those Times to be again admitted, and this was the Law established by the *Councils* of those Times in *Rome*, *Africa*, and many other places, touching the receiving of Penitents. This, saith (t) *Garsias Lomisa* is that which *Cyprian* stiles, *affording them the Peace of the Church, even the giving them admission to the Body and the* Blood *of Christ.* According to this Law which generally obtained, *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* left it in command to his *Presbyter*, that *if any of the Penitents who were about to depart this Life, should ask it, and chiefly, if they had before been Supplicants for it,* (u) *they should participate of the Divine Gifts, and so be sent out of the World.* This is that (x) *old Canonical* Law, confirmed by the first *Nicene Council*, that if any one (who had not finished his time of Penance) was about to die, he should not be deprived, τελείᾳ καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτῃ ἐφοδίῳ, *of his last and most necessary Viaticum*; that is, say *Zonaras* and *Balsamon*, he should not be deprived, τῆς μεταλήψεως τῶν ἁγιασμάτων, *of the participation of the consecrated* Gifts: Τῆς τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων μεταλήψεως; *of the participation of the Divine* Mysteries, saith (y) *Matthew Blastares.*

(o) Ep. 16.

(p) Vis infertur corpori ejus & sanguini. *De Lapsis*, p. 128.

(q) Quod non statim Domini corpus inquinatis manibus accipiat, aut ore polluto Domini sanguinem bibat.

(r) Ut Laicus communicet, *Ep.* 55.

(s) Hæc erat tunc temporis cummunio Laica cujus adeo participes Eucharistica Sacramenta, Speciem inquam utramque panis & vini sumebant.

(t) Hoc est, apud Cyprianum lapsis pacem dari, Hoc est, ad communionem corporis & sanguinis Domini admitti. *Not in Can.* 11. *Concil. Tolet. undecimi.*

(u) Hist. Eccl. l. 6. cap. 44. Vide Not. in locum.

(x) Ὁ παλαιὸς καὶ κανονικὸς νόμος διαφυλαχθήσεται. Can. 13.

(y) Con. Oxon. Tom. 2. p. 180.

This

This is that Law of the *Fathers* of which (z) *Gregorius Nyſſen* ſpeaks, when he ſaith, That *the Philanthropy of the Fathers took care, that if any departed this Life, having not finiſhed his Penance, he ſhould,* μεταλαχεῖν τῆς ἁγιασμάτων, *participate of the conſecrated* Gifts, *that he might not be ſent out of the World without his Viaticum.*

(z) Epiſt. Canon. p. 121.

The ſame we learn from the 6th Canon of the *Council* of *Ancyra*, which commands, If theſe Penitents be in danger of Death, they ſhall then be permitted, ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ πλήρωμα, *to Come to full Communion*; εἰς κοινωνίαν τῆς ἁγίων δώρων; *to the Communion of the* Holy Gifts, ſaith *Zonaras*: Εἰς τὴν τῆς θείων ἁγιασμάτων μετάληψιν; *To the participation of the Divine Sacraments*, ſaith *Balſamon*. From the 73 *Canon* of (a) St. *Baſil*, which Decrees, That *he who denies Chriſt* (in times of Peace) *ſhall be a Penitent all his Life, and only be admitted to the participation of the* Sacraments *at his Death*; and from the Second *Canon* of *Gregorius Nyſſen*, which Decrees in like manner, That ſuch a one ſhall be, ἀμέτοχος τῆς μυστικῶν ἁγιασμάτων μέχρι τῆς ἐξόδου, *deprived of the Myſtical* Sacraments *till he comes to die, and only then partake of them.*

(a) Ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ᾧ ἐκβαίνει τὸ βίος τῆς ἁγιασμάτων ἀξιώμενος.

Now albeit thoſe Canons ſpeak chiefly of ſuch perſons as were in a ſtate of *Penitence*, yet ſince, as (b) *Garſia Loaiſa* notes, it was looked upon by the *Ancients* as *an Argument of eternal Life, and an heavenly Gift granted to thoſe who were going to their eternal Reſt, to be worthily refreſhed, pabulo* Corporis & Sanguinis Domini, *with the Food of* the Body and the Blood of our Lord, *which therefore was fitly called their Viaticum.* And ſince it cannot be imagined, that the *Faithful* ſhould at the cloſe of their Life be excluded from what was granted to the *Penitents*, theſe *Canons* muſt convince us, that it was a ſtanding and univerſal Cuſtom of the whole *Church* of *Chriſt*, confirmed as ſuch by the firſt *Nicene Council*, to give the Sacrament *in both kinds* to dying Perſons. And though we cannot doubt that a Cuſtom eſtabliſhed by ſo many *Canons*, continued to be obſerved in the *Church*, had we no other Evidence of its continuance to future Ages, yet in this caſe we find great evidence of the continuance of this Cuſtom for a Thouſand Years. For the 11*th. Council* of *Toledo* ſaith, That (c) *the infirmity of humane nature*

(b) Not. in Can. 11. Con. Tolet undec.

(c) Solet humanæ naturæ infirmitas, in ipſo mortis exitu prægravata, tanto ſiccitatis pondere deprimi, ut nullis ciborum illationibus refici, ſed vix tandem illati delectetur poculi gratia ſuſtentari, quod etiam

etiam in multorum exitu vidimus, qui optatum suis votis S. Communionis expetentes Viaticum, collatam sibi a Sacerdote Eucharistiam rejecerunt, non quod infidelitate hoc agerent, sed quod, præter Dominici Calicis haustum, traditam sibi non possunt Eucharistiam deglutire. — Quicunque ergo fidelis inevitabili qualibet infirmitate coactus, Eucharistiam perceptam rejecerit, in nullo Ecclesiæ damnationi subjaceat. *Concil. Tom. 6. pag.* 552.

was often at the time of Death depressed with such a weight of drought that they could scarce receive the Cup, that they had seen this in the exit of many, who desired the wished for Viaticum of the Holy Communion, have cast out of their Mouths the Eucharist given to them by the Priest, not out of infidelity, but because they could swallow nothing besides a draught of the sacred Cup. Whence they Decree, That *whosoever of the Faithful, by an inevitable infirmity being compelled to do it, casts out of his Mouth the sacred Eucharist, shall be subject to no penalty for so doing.* Whence we learn, 1*st*. That dying Persons then desired this Viaticum in both kinds. 2*dly*. That the *Priests* accordingly did attempt to give it them in both kinds. 3*dly*. That it was culpable then not to receive both, except in cases of necessity unavoidable.

3. This will be farther evident from the very Forms of Communicating the Sick, used in the *Ancient Liturgies* of the *Church*, and from the *Canons* which concern this Affair. For, after the *Unction* of the infirm Person, it was the Custom to give him the Communion, and that he received in both kinds, is evident from the words of the *Priest*, who ministred the *Sacrament*; *viz.* (*d*) *The Body and* Blood *of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy Soul to Life eternal:* And from the following Prayer, viz. (*e*) *Father omnipotent, eternal God, we faithfully pray thee that the Holy Body and* Blood *of our Lord received by our Brother, thy Servant, may tend to the Salvation of his Body and Soul.* (*f*) *Hugh Menard* tells us from a Manuscript of St. *Remy* of *Rheims*, That *when the Sacrament was ministred to such as were not extream ill, it was said unto them separately, the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ keep you to life everlasting, the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ ransom you to Life everlasting*, which words make a separate and distinct reception. But as for those who were at the point of Death, these two Expressions were joined together,

(*d*) Corpus & sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi custodiat animam tuam in vitam æternam. *Amen.*

(*e*) Domine Sancte Pater Omnipotens æterne Deus, te fideliter deprecamur ut accipienti huic fratri nostro famulo tuo Sacro-sanctum Corpus & sanguinem Jesu Christi filii tui Domini nostri tum Corporis & animæ sit salus. *Ex Theodori Pœniten. p.* 326.

(*f*) Apud Larroq. Hist. Euch. p. 135, 136.

ther, *The Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt preſerve thy Soul unto everlaſting Life*, becauſe there was given to the Sick Perſon in a Spoon the Body of our Lord ſteeped in the Holy Blood. The reaſon of this ſteeping we learn from the (*g*) *Canon* of the *Council* of *Tours*, cited by *Regino*, That *every Prieſt ſhall have his* Pyx *or Veſſel worthy of ſo great a Sacrament, where the Body of our Lord ſhall be carefully reſerved for the Viaticum of the Sick, and that this ſacred Oblation* ought to be ſteeped in the Blood of Chriſt, *that the Prieſt may truly ſay to the Infirm*, The Body and the Blood *of our Lord profit thee to Life eternal, and for the Remiſſion of Sins.*

(*g*) Quæ ſacra oblatio intincta debet eſſe in ſanguine Chriſti, ut veraciter Presbyter poſſit dicere infirmo, corpus & ſanguis Domini proficiat tibi in vitam æternam. *De Diſcip. Eccleſ. l.* 1. *can.* 70.

Now this practice, and the reaſon of the practice here aſſigned and approved of, do expreſly ſhew their Faith was this, That the *Prieſt* could not name them both without a Lye, unleſs he gave both; and that they who enjoined that what *Chriſt* had inſtituted to be received ſeparately, ſhould rather be received together, than that either Species ſhould not be received at all, did think both Species neceſſary to a full and entire Communion, as it hath been well noted by *Caſſander*. For to what purpoſe ſhould they ſo carefully require this intinction, if they had then believed that there was nothing wanting to the Grace, or the integrity of the Communion, when they received under one Species alone?

And though this be abundantly ſufficient to ſhew what was the practice of the Church till the 12*th. Century*, yet it is eaſie to produce farther evidence of this matter. A *Synod* held in the *Region* of *Ticinum*, and therefore ſtiled *Synodus Regio Ticinenſis*, thus Decrees, That (*h*) *if he who is infirm is in a ſtate of Penance, he cannot have the benefit of this Myſtery*, viz. of Sacred Unction, *unleſs being firſt reconciled, he be worthy of the Communion of* the Body and the Blood of Chriſt. And amongſt the things which *viſibly* and *wholeſomly* are done in the *Church*, (*i*) *Algerus* mentioneth *the giving the Body and Blood of our Lord for the Viaticum of the Sick*. In the 13th. Century (*k*) *Lucas Biſhop* of *Tuy* informs us of an *Heretick*, who being Sick was admoniſhed by his

(*h*) Si is qui infirmatur publicæ pœnitentiæ mancipatus eſt, non poteſt hujus myſterii conſequi medicinam, niſi prius reconciliatione percepta communionem corporis & *ſanguinis* Chriſti meruerit. *Concil. Tom.* 8. *p.* 64.

(*i*) In perceptione corporis & ſanguinis ejus — infirmis Viaticum dari. *L.* 1. *de Sacr. Euch. cap.* 7. *fol.* 18. b.

(*k*) L. 3. contr. Albing. cap. 7.

Hoſt

Hoſt *to ſend for a Prieſt, and diſcourſe with him as a Penitent, that he might receive from him*, Sanctiſſimum Sacramentum corporis & ſanguinis Domini, *the moſt holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord.* Now all theſe Inſtances do plainly ſhew, that it was far from being a received and *authorized Cuſtom* of the *Church*, to Communicate the Sick under the Species of Bread alone, or to give nothing to them, but one Species only.

On the contrary, it is extreamly evident from all the *Canons* of the *Church* produced, touching the caſe of *Penitents* and others, that it was a thing eſtabliſhed by the higheſt *Authority* of the *whole Church* of *Chriſt*, that both the holy *Myſteries* ſhould be exhibited to the infirm and dying Perſon. And ſeeing the *Ancients* looked upon it as ſo great a benefit to dying Perſons, to be refreſhed with the food of the Body and the Blood of Chriſt, ſince they took ſo much care to give the Bread ſteeped in the conſecrated Wine to them, who, through infirmity of Body, could not ſwallow it down dry, and to miniſter each Species apart to them who were not extream ill; ſince, as (*l*) *Regino* doth inform us, they determined, that great care was to be taken, leaſt the doing this being deferr'd too long, it ſhould prove to the deſtruction of the Soul, our *Lord* having ſaid, unleſs you eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man and drink his Blood, you ſhall have no life in you. I ſay, from all theſe things it is extreamly evident, that it was a received, and in ſubjects capable, was deemed a neceſſary thing to communicate the infirm and dying perſon under both Species of Bread and Wine.

(*l*) De Diſcipl. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 195.

§. 6. Moreover, that Children alſo, if capable of doing ſo, received in both kinds, will be evident againſt the precarious Aſſertion of *J. L.* 1. From the clear Teſtimony of St. *Cyprian* in his Book *De Lapſis*, for there he introduceth the Children who by their Parents were carried to eat things offered to *Idols*, or to offer to them, thus pleading of their Cauſe to God, (*m*) *We have done nothing, nor did we of our own accords, leaving* the Meat and Cup of the Lord, *haſten to theſe prophane contagious Solemnities, our Parents were our Parricides.* Where he affords us a plain demonſtration, that they then ordinarily

(*m*) Nos nihil fecimus, nec derelicto cibo & poculo Domini, ad profana contagia ſponte properavimus, perdidit nos aliena perfidia, parentes ſenſimus parricidas, *p.* 125.

ordinarily received both the Elements; for had they not, as many as were capable, received the Bread, as well as the Cup, why doth he introduce them purging themſelves from the neglect of both? Why doth he make them, with as much care, to plead, *We did not leave the meat*, as we left not *the Cup of the Lord?*

Having thus ſhewed the cuſtom of this Age, I ſhall conſider what is, from St. *Cyprian*, ſuggeſted to the contrary, *viz.* that he relates, That *the ſolemnities being ended, the Deacon who preſented the Holy Cup to the Faithful, being to give it to a Child, ſhe* Pag. 67. *turned away her face, as not able to ſupport ſo great Majeſty; ſhe ſhut her Mouth, and refuſed the Chalice, and when the Deacon had forced ſome of it into her Mouth, ſhe could not retain it in thoſe defiled Entrails, ſo great was the power and Majeſty of our Lord.* Whence it is argued, that ſhe received the Cup only. Now to give a clear and ſatisfactory Anſwer to this *Objection*, it will be neceſſary to reflect a little upon the Cuſtoms of theſe times, as *V. Gr.*

1. The buſineſs of the *Deacon*, which was not to adminiſter the Bread, but when the *Prieſt* or *Biſhop* had adminiſtred that, to follow with the Cup. So the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* order, (*n*) *Let the Biſhop give the Oblation, ſaying, The Body of Chriſt* —— And *the Deacon let him hold the Cup, and giving it, let him ſay, The Blood of Chriſt, the Cup of Life.* And accordingly here, this happened, ſaith St. *Cyprian*, (*o*) *When the Deacon began to diſtribute the Cup* to them that were preſent; and is it then to be admired, that here is no mention made of the Body? if hence it follows, That no Body was diſtributed to this Child, it alſo follows, that no Body was given to the reſt of the *Faithful* then preſent; for there is no more mention made of the Body given to them, than of the Body given to the Child. Nor could S. *Cyprian* regularly ſpeak of it, when diſcourſing of the *Deacon*, who then miniſtred the Cup only.

(*n*) Ὁ δὲ διάκονος ἐπιχείτω τὸ ποτήριον καὶ ὀνομάζων λεγέτω, Αἷμα Χριϛοῦ. Lib. 8. c. 13.

(*o*) Ubi Calicem Diaconus offere præſentibus cœpit. *P.* 132.

2. Note Secondly, That the *Children* received in the Rank of the *Women*; ſo the ſame *Conſtitutions*, ſpeaking of that order in which the *Euchariſt* was to be received, ſaith, (*p*) *Amongſt the Women let the Diaconeſſes, the Virgins, and the Widows Receive, and then the Children*; and this was doubtleſs ordered

(*p*) Ἐν δὲ ταῖς γυναιξὶν αἱ διακόνισσαι καὶ αἱ παρθένοι καὶ αἱ χῆραι δέχεσθω τὰ παιδία. Ibid.

dered so, that the Women might take care of their *Children*, and assist them in Receiving; accordingly, this *Child* comes in the Arms of its Mother, and when she had Received, *Locus ejus advenit, Came the time for the Child to Receive too.*

Ibid.

3. Note thirdly, That the Bread was not then put into the Mouth, as it is now in the *R. Church*, but it was given into the Hand of the *Receiver*, to eat at leasure of it, whilst the *Bishop* or *Priest* went on distributing, as is acknowledged by the learned (q) *Doctors* of the *Church* of *Rome*, and proved by innumerable Testimonies of the *Ancients*. Now it is not to be conceived that they who had a reverence for the Holy Sacrament would put it into the Hands of little *Children*, who might let it fall, or throw it away, or that the *Priest* should stay till he could make the Child eat, or swallow it down, but rather, that he should give it to the *Mother*, from whose Hands the Child more likely would receive it, and who could better chew it for, and put it down his Throat. This being so, the Bread might be given to the *Mother* for the Child to eat at leasure, and the *Priest* take no notice of her refusal to receive it; but then, because the Cup was by the *Deacon* to be received again into his hands to be distributed to others, he must stay till the Child had participated, and so he must endeavour to make it drink of it. And this, I verily believe, is the whole Truth touching this instance; which therefore is no proof at all, that both the Symbols were not offer'd, or distributed to this Child, but only that she had not eaten of the Bread given to her Mother for her use, before the *Deacon* followed with the Cup. Nor can this reasonably be questioned, if we consider how constantly the Tradition of the *Church* informs us in all the following Centuries, that Children received in both kinds: For,

(q) *Vid.* Dallæum de cult. lat. l. 5. c. 2.

To omit the passage in the *Apostolick Constitutions*, where they are reckoned amongst those who received the *Eucharist*; when without any distinction or exception, the *Bishop* separately gave the Bread, and the *Deacon* the Cup to all. *Dionysius* in the *Fourth Century* informs us, That (r) *little Children did partake of the most holy* Symbols *of the divine Communion.* And *Theodorus Bishop* of *Mopsuestia*, expresly notes, That (s) *they*

(r) Μετέχους γένεσθαι ἱερατάτων τῆς θεαρχικῆς κοινωνίας συμβόλων. Phot. c. 177.

Eccles. Hier. c. 7. p. 360, 361.

(s) Τὴν τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματος κοινωνίαν

gave

gave to Infants the Communion of the immaculate Body for the Remiſſion of Sins, where (t) Photius adds, That he invented many abſurd things, that he might ſolve the queſtion of thoſe that asked, *Why do Children partake of the* Holy Myſteries? in the plural, and that he might have found out better Solutions of that queſtion, and given better accounts of that Cuſtom then he did; he therefore Synecdochically ſpake of the Receiving both theſe *Myſteries*. The paſſages of St. *Auſtin* in the fifth Century are very numerous, in which he both aſſerts it as an *univerſal Practice*, that little Children did partake of the Body and the Blood of Chriſt, and alſo ſaith, that *without eating of his Fleſh and drinking of his Blood, they could not have eternal Life*. But having produced theſe already, I only add his Teſtimony that (t) *Pope Innocent* the Firſt declared, *That Infants could not have Life without the participation of the Body and the Blood of Chriſt*.

(t) Ἵνα λύσῃ τὴν ἀπορίαν τῶν λεγόντων διὰ τί τὰ βρέφη κοινωνεῖ τῶν ἀχράντων μυστηρίων. p. 400.

(t) Innocentius P. ſine Baptiſmo Chriſti & ſine participatione corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti vitam non habere parvulos dicit, *Contra duas Ep. Pelag. l. 2. c. 4.*

To proceed now in farther confirmation of our Aſſertion, "There is no better proof, nor better interpreter of a Cuſtom, "than the Cuſtom it ſelf, nothing which more demonſtrates "that a Cuſtom comes from the firſt Ages, than when it is "ſeen to continue ſucceſſively to the laſt: This of communicating little Children, not under the Species of Wine only, but of Bread alſo, or of both, is evidently ſuch; for, in the 6th. Century (u) *Gregory* of *Tours* makes mention of a *Jewiſh* Child coming with other Children *to the Communion of Chriſt's Body and Blood*. In the 7th. Century the (x) 11th. *Council* of *Toledo*, excuſes thoſe from cenſure, *qui Euchariſtiam receptam in tempore infantiæ rejecerunt, who in their Infancy have caſt out the Bread received into their Mouths*. In the 8th. *Century* we are informed by *Charles* the *Great*, that this was then the general Cuſtom of the *Church* of God; for, againſt the Doctrine of the Second *Nicene Council*, and of the *Roman Church* pronouncing *Anathema* to thoſe who did not worſhip Images, he and his *Council* of 300 *Biſhops* argue thus, that *then Infantes* (y) *Baptiſmatis unda loti, & corporis dominici edulio & ſanguinis hauſtu ſatiati, pereunt; Infants who have been Baptized, and have received*

(u) De glor. Martyr. l. c. 10.

(x) Concil. Tom. 6. p. 552.

(y) Car. Mag. de Imaginib. l. 2. c. 27.

ceived the Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood must perish. In the 9th. *Century* we are told by (z) *Jesse* Bishop of *Amiens*, That the Infant was confirmed *by the* Body and Blood *of Christ*, *that he might be his Member*. By (a) *Rabanus Maurus*, who saith, That *the precedent Sacrament of Baptism is confirmed in the Baptized Person by* the Body and Blood *of our Lord*; *for he therefore ought to receive these things, that he may be his Member who died, and rose again for us, and may deserve to have God dwelling in him: For he who is Truth it self saith, He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood abides in me, and I in him, and also, Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you shall have no Life in you.* By (b) *Theodulph* Bishop of *Orleans*, That *when any one is new born by Water and the Spirit, he is nourished with the body of our Lord, and* drinks his Blood. By the old (c) *Roman Pontifical*, which saith, That *the Infant being Baptized, he is presently confirmed and communicated by the Bishop, saying*, The Body and the Blood of Christ, &c. In the 10th. *Century* we are informed of the continuance of the same Custom from a *Pontifical* written about the year 980, saith *Baluzius*, where it is commanded, (d) *That the Baptized Infant should presently be Confirmed and Communicated by the Bishop, or in his absence by the Priest, saying, The* Body *of our Lord Jesus Christ keep thee to Life eternal.* In the 11th. *Century* we find the same Custom in (e) *Alcuin* from the very same words, which, saith he, were then used at the Communicating of the Infant after *Baptism*. And in the Three and thirtieth *Epistle* of *Lanfranck* we find these words, (f) *We believe that it is generally very expedient for all Persons, of all Ages, living and dying, to arm themselves with the Reception of* our Lord's body and his blood. Whence, saith (g) *Baluzius*, we gather, That *in his time it was the Custom to give* to Children the Communion of the Lord's Body and his Blood. And *Hugh Menard*, doth ingenuously confess, That *the Custom*

(z) Apud Menardum Not. in Greg. Sacr. p. 107.

(a) Corpore & sanguine Dominico omne præcedens Sacramentum in eo confirmatur, quia hæc ideo accipere debet, &c. *De Instit. Cleric. l. 1. cap. 29.*

(b) De Ord. Baptiz. c. 18.

(c) Statim autem confirmetur infans & communicetur ab Episcopo ita dicente, Corpus & Sanguis Domini, &c. *Baluz. Not. in Reg. p. 551.*

(d) Statim enim confirmari oportet Chrismate, & postea communicari, & si Episcopus deest, communicetur a Presbytero dicente, Corpus Domini Jesu Christi custodiat te in vitam æternam. *Bal. not. in Reg. p. 552.*

(e) Ne lactentur antequam communicent. *De Sabb. Pasch. p. 64.*

(f) Credimus enim generaliter expedire omnes omnibus ætatibus tam viventes quam morientes dominici corporis & sanguinis perceptione se munire. *Apud Baluz. ibid. p. 657.*

(g) Not. ad librum Sacram. p. 298.

of

of giving the body of Chriſt to Children, continued till the time of Paſchal *the Second*, and that they gave it to them then dipp'd in the *Wine*, by reaſon of the weakneſs of their Age.

That this was the Opinion of the *Greek Church* even almoſt to our preſent Age, we learn from (*b*) *Arcadius*, whoſe words are theſe, *They judge the Sacrament of the Euchariſt to be required of neceſſity to Salvation, both to Adult and Infants, ſo teach* Simeon Theſſalonicenſis, Nicholaus Cabaſilas, *and* Gabriel Philadelphienſis, who all ſay, that the (*i*) *Communion is* therefore *neceſſary*, becauſe the Lord hath ſaid, *If you do not eat my Fleſh and drink my Blood, you have no life in you. We Baptize Infants*, ſaith (*k*) *Jeremiah* their *Patriarch, and afterwards we give them the Communion; for, according to St.* Baſil, *he that is regenerated, wants ſtill ſpiritual Food; and our Lord hath ſaid, Unleſs you eat*, &c. (*l*) *Metrophanes Critopulus* adds, That *their Infants are Baptized, and that then they afterwards partake as oft as their Parents will, ἑκατέρου εἴδους τοῦ ἐν τῇ Δεσποτικῇ τραπέζῃ, of both Species, at the Lord's Table*, The *Georgians, Circaſſians*, and *Mengrelians* are of the ſame Religion with the *Greek Church* in all things, and therefore muſt be of the ſame Opinion in this Matter. The *Armenians* miniſter the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt* to Infants in both kinds. So do the *Habaſſines*, ſaith (*m*) *Alvarez*, and the *Maronites*, ſaith (*n*) *Brierwood*.

(*b*) L. 3. de S. Euch. cap 40.

(*i*) Ἡ δὲ θεία κοινωνία ἀναγκαία ἐστὶν ὅτι φησὶν ὁ Κύριος· ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε καὶ πίητε.

(*k*) Μεταδιδόαμεν δὲ αὐτοῖς ὕστερον τῆς θείας κοινωνίας. Act. cum Virtumb. Ep. 1. c. 9. p. 85.

(*l*) Eccl. ord. c. 9. p. 98.

(*m*) Viagg. de Æthiop. c. 22.

(*n*) P. 178.

And here let it be noted, that not the latter *Grecians* only, but the *Ancient Fathers* did generally hold that this was neceſſary to be done, by virtue of that Precept, *Except you eat my Fleſh and drink my Blood, you ſhall have no Life in you*, from whence it is extreamly evident, that neither in the Fifth Age, when Infants were by virtue of this Text admitted to the Sacrament; nor in the following Ages of the *Church*, could it be an eſtabliſhed Cuſtom, to give to Children the Cup only.

Laſtly, That neither *Leo* nor *Gelaſius* gave any *new Precept to the Church* touching this Matter, is partly evident from what hath been already ſaid, nor are there any Footſteps of this new imaginary Law to be found in their *Decrees*: For the

§. 7. Chap. 5. §. 2.

words of *Leo* only command, That when the Sacrilegious dissembling of the *Manichees* was discovered, *they should be driven by the Priests Authority from the Society of the Saints.* And the words of *Gelasius* do only say, That *they, who, in the Region of* Squillaci, *were bound up by a Superstition unknown to him, from receiving the Cup, should either receive the whole Sacrament, or be kept back from the whole.* Where now, I pray you, is any appearance of this new pretended *Law*, or *First Ecclesiastical Precept*, That *all the Faithful should from henceforth be obliged to receive under both Species*, unless those words of *Gelasius* import, that the Receiving of the Bread without the Cup is not Receiving an *entire Sacrament*; or, unless his following Reason, That *the division of one and the same Mystery cannot happen without Sacrilege*, be a general Rule concerning all the Faithful?

But to dispute no longer in a case so plain, both *Leo* and *Gelasius* sufficiently inform us of the practice of their times; for *Leo* doth not only say, That (*o*) *participatio Corporis & sanguinis Christi, this participation of the Body and Blood of* Christ *is that by which the New Creature is fed and inebriated, from the Lord himself*, That (*p*) *in the Church of God, in the Mystical distribution of the spiritual Nourishment, the Body and the Blood of Christ is taken:* But adds, That (*q*) *the Lord saying, Unless you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and* drink *his Blood, you shall have no Life in you; we ought so to communicate of this Holy Table, as not to doubt of the Truth of the Body and Blood of Christ.* *Gelasius* also saith, That *the Sacraments we take of the Body and Blood of Christ are a Divine Thing, whence by them we are made partakers of a Divine Nature, and yet the Substance and Nature of Bread and Wine doth not cease to be, or to remain,* and in this Decree, that *the taking of both Species is the taking of one and the self-same Mystery*, which therefore is not celebrated by taking of one Species only, and that the not receiving of the Cup, when the Bread hath been taken, is *the dividing of one and the self-same Mystery*, or the destroying of its Unity; so that he argues against this practice from a Reason essential to the *Mystery*, and which respects the Unity thereof, which, by the practice of receiving in one kind only, is destroyed.

(*o*) De pass. domini Serm. 14. p. 284.

(*p*) Ep. 46. c. 2. p. 518.

(*q*) Ser. Sancto de jejun. Sept. mensis Ser. 89.

Disp. de duabus naturis Christi Bib. patrum. Tom. 4. p. 432.

Having thus demonstrated that the *Fathers* and *Doctors* of the *Church* till the 12th. Century taught, *That the Laity by divine Precept were obliged to receive both kinds*, when they were capable

Cap. 1.

of

of doing ſo. That they condemned *all variation from the matter of the Inſtitution*, and the Doctrine of *Concomitance*. That they conceived the Receiving of the Cup by the Laity was requiſite *to their ſhewing forth the Lord's Death, their Union to Chriſt, the increaſe of Grace, the Remiſſion of their Sins, the Sanctification and Salvation of their Souls and Bodies*; and laſtly, for their receiving an *entire Communion*. That *they conſtantly exhorted the People, having received the Bread, to take the Cup alſo*, declaring that it was *Unlawful, Erroneous*, and even *Sacrilegious* to receive the one without the other, if they were capable of receiving both; and having fully anſwered and confuted all that *J. L.* hath offered to the contrary, I ſhall conclude in theſe words of Mr. *Condom* on this ſubject a little varied; *viz.* *Thus many conſtant practices of the Primitive Church, thus many different Circumſtances, whereby it appears in particular and in publick, and always with an univerſal approbation, and according to the eſtabliſhed Law, that ſhe gave the Communion under* [both] *Species, ſo many Ages before the Council* of *Conſtance*, and from the *Origin* of *Chriſtianity, till the time of this Council, do invincibly demonſtrate, that this Council did* [thwart] *the Tradition of all Ages, when it defined that the Communion under one kind was as good and ſufficient as under both, and that in which manner ſoever they took it, they neither contradicted the Inſtitution of Jeſus Chriſt, nor deprived themſelves of the Fruit of this Sacrament.*

Cap. 2. 6.
Cap. 3. 5.
Cap 4.
Cap. 6. 5.
Cap. 8.
P. 160.
P. 161.

In his Second Part, Sect. 4th. he lays down this as a principle which alone carries along with it the deciſion of this Queſtion. *viz.* That *in all practical Matters we muſt always regard what has been underſtood and practiſed by the Church.* That *the true means to underſtand God's Holy Law, is to conſider in what manner it has been always underſtood and obſerved in the Church. Since there appears in this Interpretation and perpetual Practice, a Tradition which cannot come but from God himſelf, and that Sence thereof which hath always appeared in the Church is as well inſpired as the Scripture it ſelf. Now by this*, as he well ſaith, *our Queſtion is decided, for in the Sacred Ceremony of the Lord's Supper, we have ſeen that the Church hath always believed and taught for a Thouſand years and upwards, that the Laity by divine Precept, and for the ends forementioned, were obliged to receive both Species, that the Fathers exhorted them to do ſo, and did, both by expreſs*

P. 194.
P. 195.
P. 196.
P. 200.
P. 203.

Declarations

Declarations, and by many Customs and determinations, sufficiently condemn the contrary Practice, when any Hereticks or Superstitious Persons did decline the Cup. That they did generally so Interpret our Saviour's Institution, that it as well concerned the Laity as Clergy, and with one voice asserted it was not lawful to vary from it, or celebrate the Mystery otherwise than it was delivered by Christ and his Apostles, and practised in the Primitive Church. Behold what has been always practised, behold what ought to stand for a Law, in opposition to all the Definitions of the Councils of Constance, Basil, Trent, *and all their* Non obstante's *to our Lord's Institution, and to the Practice of the Primitive Church.*

FINIS.